



NYĀYA-SŪTRAS OF GAUṬAMA.

WITH

THE BHĀṢYA OF VĀTSYĀYANA

*With notes from the Nyāyavārtikatātparyatikā of Vācaspati
Miśra and the Tātparyapariśuddhi of Udayanācārya*

DISCOURSE I

DAILY LESSON I

Lecture 1

**Pronunciation of Subjects, Purpose and Connection
of the Treatise**

Sūtra 1

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The Instruments (or Means) of Right Cognition* must be regarded as rightly effective, because it is only when a thing is known by means of an Instrument of Right Cognition that there is possibility of its giving rise to fruitful and effective exertion. As a matter of fact, nothing can be known except through an Instrument of Cognition; nor can fruitful exertion be aroused, except when things have become known.

As it is only when the agent has cognised a thing by means of an Instrument of Cognition that he desires either to acquire or get rid of it; and the effort of the agent stimulated by this desire to acquire or get rid of the thing known is what is called exertion; and this exertion is called 'fruitful' when it becomes attended to a result.

* This word 'pramāṇa' is used both in the sense of 'instrument of right cognition' (in which case the right cognition is the direct fruit, and ultimate cognition only the indirect fruit), and in that of 'right cognition,' in which case the exertion is the direct fruit. In the present context we take the word to mean 'instrument of right cognition' because of what follows in lines 23 of p. 2, where the 'pramāṇa' is distinguished from pramāṇi or Right Cognition.

That is to say, when the person putting forth exertion¹ desiring either to acquire or get rid of the thing, comes by exertion, actually to acquire or to discard it, his exertion becomes 'fruitful'

The 'object' or 'thing' (cognised by means of the Instrument of Cognition) is of four kinds viz (1) pleasure (2) source of pleasure, (3) pain, and (4) source of pain. These objects the Instruments of Cognition are innumerable owing to the fact of the number of living creatures being infinite. It is only when the Instrument of Right Cognition duly operates with regard to an object, that due success can belong to the 'cogniser' (who then only can have any idea of the object),—to the 'cognised object' (which then only can have its true character known), and to the 'right cognition' (which then only can lead to the apprehension of the object), because there is no possibility of the object being accomplished, so long as the most effective cause is not present [and it is the Instrument of Cognition which is the most effective cause].²

'Cogniser' (*Pramātr*) means that person who is stimulated to exertion by the desire to acquire or discard the object—that is means of which the person obtains the right cognition of the thing is called the 'Instrument of Right Cognition' (*Pramāṇa*) the thing which is rightly known is called the 'cognised object' (*Prameya*), and the apprehending or knowledge of the thing is called 'right cognition' (*Pramiti*). It is on all these four factors that the real nature of things is dependent (for its being accepted or rejected, or treated with indifference)

'Now what is this 'real nature' (of things)?'

It is nothing else but 'being' or 'existence' in the case of that which is (or exists), and 'non-being' or 'non-existence' in the case of that which is not (does not exist). That is to say, when something that 'is' (or exists) is apprehended as *being* or *existent*—that it is apprehended as what it really is, and not as something of a contrary nature (i.e. as 'non-being')—then that which thus apprehended constitutes the 'true nature' of the thing. And analogously, when a non-entity is apprehended as such—that is, as what it really is not as something of a contrary nature,—the

* 'Anyatamarthah sadbhakatamartho draṣṭavyah'—Varaṇasi

that which is thus apprehended, constitutes the 'true nature' of the thing (of the non entity)

"But how is it possible for the latter,—i.e., the non entity that which does not exist—to be cognised by means of an Instrument of Right Cognition?"

This is possible we reply, because as a matter of fact, at the time that the existent thing is cognised (by means of the Instrument of Cognition) the non existent thing is not cognised. That is to say, there is non cognition of the non existent, and this shows that it is only by means of the Instrument of Cognition, whereby the existent is cognised, that we cognise also the non existence of the non existent.* We illustrate this by reference to a lamp when the lamp illumines and renders visible something that is visible,—that which is not seen in the same manner as that visible thing, is regarded to be non existent the mental process being as follows 'if the thing existed it would be seen,—as it is not seen, it must be concluded not to exist' In the same manner, at the time that the existent thing is cognised by means of an Instrument of Cognition, if at the same time, something else is not equally cognised, the conclusion is that this latter does not exist, the mental process being as follows 'if the thing existed it would be cognised,—as it is not cognised it must be concluded not to exist' Thus we find that the same Instrument of Cognition which manifests—makes known—the existent thing, also manifests or makes known, the non existent thing. The 'Entity' that which exists is going to be described by means of a comprehensive group of sixteen

From among (endless) entities (e.g. *Pramana* etc and many such other things as the grains of sand etc)

Sutra 1

It is the knowledge of the real essence (or true character) of the following sixteen categories that leads to the attainment of the Highest Good—(1) The means of Right Cognition (2) The objects of Right Cognition (3) Doubt, (4) Motive, (5) Example, (6) Theory (7) Factors of Inference.

* The only difference thus between the *existent* and the *non existent* is that, while the former forms the object of the Instrument of Cognition directly, the latter does so only indirectly—i.e. through something that exists

(8) Cogitation, (9) Demonstrated Truth (10) Discussion, (11) Disputation (12) Wrangling (13) Fallacious Reason (14) Casuistry, (15) Futile Rejoinder, and (16) Clinchers

BHĀṢYA

* When expounding the compound in which the above categories are mentioned each of them should be stated by means of words having the singular, dual or plural form in accordance with the actual number of the category concerned as described later on. The compound is the *Dvandva* of the copulative class. The Genitive ending at the end of the compound word '*Pramanapramēya tattva*' has the force of the 'śesa † (that is, signified relationship in general), the Genitive ending involved in the compound '*tattvajñāna*' (which is equivalent to *tattvasya jñānam*)—as also that involved in the compound '*nīśreyasādhigamaḥ*' (*nīśreyasasya adhigamaḥ*),—has the sense of the accusative.

Those enumerated in the Sūtra are the entities or categories for the true knowledge of which the present treatise has been propounded. Thus the present Sūtra should be taken as stating in brief the purport of the whole treatise,—this purport being that the Highest Good is attained by the knowledge of the essence of such things as the Soul and the rest: this same idea is further elaborated in the next Sūtra,—the sense of which is that the Highest Good is attained when one has rightly understood the real nature of—(a) that which is fit to be discarded (e.g. pain) along with its causes, (i.e., ignorance and desire, merit and demerit as leading to pain), (b) that which is absolutely destructive (of pain, i.e., true knowledge), (c) the means of its destruction (i.e., the scientific treatises) and (d) the goal to be attained (i.e., Highest Good), these being the four kinds of objects dealt with (by all philosophical treatises).

An objection is raised —'The mention of *Doubt* and the rest apart by themselves is superfluous because all these, being in-

* The Vārtika makes the sentence '*caṭhe dvandvasamāśaḥ*' precede '*nirdeśe yathācāram viśraḥ*'. This also appears to be the natural order: the explanation of the particular form that the *viśraḥ* is to take can come only after the particular compound has been noted.

† '*Śesa*' is a grammatical technical name given to that which does not fall within any of the case relations denotative of active agency towards an action. In the case of the Genitive when no case relation is found possible, it has to be taken as expressing mere relationship in general.

cluded either among 'the Means of Cognition' or among 'the Objects of Cognition', cannot be regarded as different from these"

This is true, but for the good of living beings have been provided the four sciences [Vedic, Agricultural, Political and Logico-Metaphysical], of which Logic-Metaphysics form the fourth, also called 'Nyaya', the Science of Reasoning,—each of these sciences deals with a distinct set of subjects, and each has its own distinct method of treatment, and as a matter of fact, Doubt and the rest form the subjects dealt with by the science of Logic-Metaphysics*, consequently, if all these were not distinctly enunciated, it would appear that this science dealt with the Soul only, like the Upanisads. It is for this reason (i.e., for the purpose of guarding against this idea) that Doubt and the other categories have been enunciated with a view to indicate clearly the distinctive subjects dealt with by this Science (which thus becomes distinguished from the other Sciences)

[The Author proceeds to show in what manner Doubt and the other categories form integral factors of the Science of Reasoning]

[A] (As regards *Doubt*, the third among the enunciated categories) *Nyāya* 'or' 'Reasoning' functions neither with regard to things unknown nor with regard to those known definitely for certain—it functions only with regard to things that are *doubtful*, as is declared in the *Sūtra* 1.1.41—'On any matter held in suspense, when the reality of things is ascertained by means of considering the two sides of the question we have what is called *Demonstrated Truth*,—in this *Sūtra*, 'suspense' stands for *Doubt*, the 'considering of the two sides' constitutes the process of reasoning, and 'the ascertainment of the reality of things,' which is 'Demonstrated Truth', forms 'the knowledge of the real nature of things'. The form in which *Doubt* appears is 'or'—'is the thing this or that?'—it is an uncertain idea that we have of things, and thus (i.e., being an *idea*), though it is an *object of cognition*, and thus already included in the second category (*Prameya*), it is mentioned separately for reasons indicated

* Thus even though Doubt, etc. may be included under the 'Means' and the 'Objects' of Cognition, it is necessary to enunciate them separately in order to indicate the several 'subjects' dealt with by the Science

above [i.e., because it forms a necessary factor, the very basis, of the process of Reasoning]

[B] As regards 'Motive' (the fourth category),—*Motive* is that, on being urged, by which man has recourse to activity, that is to say, it is that, desiring either to obtain or reject which, man has recourse to an action, and as such this bears upon (or affects) all living beings, all actions and all sciences. and this forms the basis of all reasoning or investigation (Nyāya) [without some motive, or end in view, no reasoning had recourse to] "What do you mean by this *nyāya* or reasoning?" It means the examination of things by means of proofs,* that is to say, Inference based upon Perception and Verbal Cognition is called 'Nyāya' or 'Reasoning', it is also called 'Anvikṣā' ('Investigation') because it consists in the reviewing (*anu-ikṣana*) of a thing previously apprehended (*ikṣita*) through Perception and Verbal Cognition, the science that proceeds by this 'investigation is *Anvikṣikī*', '*Nyāyavidyā*', '*Nyāyāśāstra*', the 'Science of Reasoning' (Logic) That Inference which is contrary to Perception and Verbal Cognition† is not true Reasoning, it is false Reasoning

[It has been asserted that 'Motive bears upon all living beings, all actions and all sciences', the author now proceeds to show what motive there is in the three kinds of Discussion, mentioned among the categories.] That in regard to this (above mentioned 'false reasoning') Discussion and Disputation serve distinct purposes is well known [Discussion being carried on for the purpose of getting at the truth, and Disputation for that of vanquishing an opponent]; as regards Wrangling, we proceed to examine whether or not it has or serves any purpose. One who has recourse to wrangling is called a *wrangler* and when pressed to state what his motive is, if he states his motive, declaring that such is his standpoint and such his theory (for establishing which he has recourse to the wrangling),—then he abandons his character of *wrangler* (a *wrangler* being one who does not take up any definite position for himself); if, on the other hand, he does not state his motive.

* The *Tātparyā* explains that by 'proofs' here are meant the five factors or members of the syllogism

† The *Tātparyā* adds 'Analogy'.

then he becomes open to the charge of being neither an ordinary man of business, nor a serious enquirer,—lastly, if (in order to escape from these contingencies) he declares his motive to consist in the showing of the impossibility or untenability of the position of his opponent (without the establishing of any position of his own),—then too he becomes open to the same contingencies, for instance, when showing the untenability of the opponent's position, he has to accept the following four factors—(1) the person showing the untenability (*i.e.* the wrangler himself), (2) the person to whom the untenability is shown, (3) that (reasoning) by means of which he shows the untenability, and (4) that (untenability) which is shown, and in accepting these, he renounces his *wranglership* [The true *wrangler* being one who does not admit any thing] If, on the other hand, he does not admit these four factors then his assertion—that his purpose lies in the showing of the untenability of his opponent's position—becomes meaningless. Then again, *Sūtra* 1-2 3 defines Wrangling as a *collection of sentences wherein there is no maintaining (of any definite standpoint)*, now if the wrangler admits what is declared by means of those sentences, then that becomes his position, which he has to maintain, if, on the other hand, he does not admit what is meant by the sentences, then, those sentences become absolutely meaningless (for him), and his putting them forward becomes a mere random incoherent babbling, and ceases to be Wrangling.*

[Having proved the presence of some motive in all actions, the author takes up the original subject, and proceeds to show how *Example*, the fifth category, and the rest of the categories enunciated, form integral factors in the Science of Reasoning, and what purposes each of them serves.]

* The *Bhā* only puts forward the arguments against there being any motive in Wrangling: it does not show how a motive is present in this form of discussion. This answer has been supplied by the *Vārtika*, wherein it is shown that the definition of Wrangling does not mean that the wrangler can have no position of his own, all that it means is that in wrangling his motive lies not in the maintaining of any position that he might hold, but simply in showing the untenability of the opponent's position. Hence even though he admits the four factors enumerated above, he does not renounce his *wranglership*.

[C] As regards *Example*, the *fifth* category,—it is some thing that is directly perceived—i.e. which cannot fail to be perceived (or known) by all enquirers—ordinary men and learned (and which needs no proof, which is self-evident), this (*Example*) is, from its very nature, an 'object of cognition' (and thus included in the *second* category), but it has been mentioned separately, because Inference and Verbal Cognition are both dependent upon it, it is only when there is an *Example* (to corroborate the premiss, for instance)—and not otherwise—that there can be a Valid Inference, or Verbal Cognition. It is thus on the basis of an *Example* that all Reasoning proceeds, as in demolishing the Opponent's position, it is necessary to show that it is opposed to (not compatible with) an *Example* (admitted by both parties), and in establishing one's own position also, it becomes necessary to show that it is corroborated by an *Example*. [There is yet another reason why importance has been attached to *Example*—it is through this that the position of the atheistic Bauddha becomes doubly untenable.] If the Atheist admits a corroborative example, he renounces his *atheistic* (*Nihilistic*) position [as by *Nihilism*, all things have merely momentary existence, and hence it is not possible for the *Example*, which must be in the form of something that existed in the past, to be present at the time that it is put forward] if, on the other hand, he does not admit an *Example*, on the basis of what could he attack the position of his Opponent? Further, the enunciation of *Example* among the categories is necessary, because it is only when the *Example* has been described that we can have the definition of the 'Instance corroborative of the inferential premiss' as propounded in *Sūtras* 1 1 36 and 37—'the Corroborative Instance is that example which possessing the properties of the Probandum is similar to it' (*Sūtra* 36), and also it is 'that *Example* which, not possessing the properties of the Probandum is dissimilar to it' (*sūtra* 37). [Thus the description of *Example* is found to be a necessary factor in the art of reasoning.]

[D] A proposition or statement of fact asserted in the form 'this is so' is called 'Theory' (or Doctrine). This is an 'object of cognition' (hence included under the *second* category); and

yet it has been enunciated separately by itself, because, it is only when there are a number of different *theories*, and never otherwise, that the three forms of discussion—Discussion, Disputation and Wrangling—become possible

[E] When a certain conclusion has to be proved, a number of words (sentences) have to be used, and the five sentences that are necessary for the proving of the conclusion are called '*Pratijñā*' (Statement of the Conclusion, Proposition) and the rest, and these five taken collectively are what have been called '*Factors*' (the *seventh* category), all the '*Means of Cognition*' (or forms of valid cognition) are found to be present among these '*Factors*', for instance, the '*Statement of the Conclusion*' is *verbal*, the '*Statement of the Probans*' is *inferential*, the '*Statement of the Instance*' is *perceptual*, the '*Statement of the Minor Premiss*' is *analogical*, and the '*Reassertion of the Conclusion*' consists in the *indicating of the capability of all the aforesaid Statements to bear upon the same object or purpose*. It is this five fold declaration that constitutes the highest form of reasoning, [as it is only when thus stated that the Reasoning succeeds in convincing the unbeliever] It is on the basis of this form of Reasoning again that the three forms of Discussion proceed, they cannot do so without it, and the ascertainment of truth also is dependent on this form of Reasoning. It is for these reasons that though the aforesaid '*Factors of reasoning*' being in the form of words, are included in the second category '*Object of Cognition*', yet they have been mentioned separately

[F] *Cogitation* is neither included among the four aforesaid '*Means of Cognition*', nor is it a distinct (fifth) '*Means of Cognition*', it however helps the '*Means of Cognition*' in that it leads to the ascertainment of their validity or invalidity, and thereby helps in the attaining of true knowledge. As an example of *Cogitation*, we have the following—There arises a doubt as to whether the birth of man is brought about by a cause that is itself caused—or by a cause that is uncaused,—or it is merely accidental, without any definite cause, and this uncertainty affords an occasion for the functioning of *Cogitation* based upon the consideration of the possible causes (and their effects), and it proceeds in the following manner—

'If birth is brought about by a cause that is itself caused, then it is only right that on the disappearance of the cause (which being caused is liable to disappearance), there should be cessation of birth,—if birth is brought about by an uncaused cause, then, the disappearance of the *uncaused* entity being impossible, there would be no possibility of any cessation of birth — if, lastly, it were without a cause, then, as coming into existence without a cause (and as such being *uncaused*, eternal), it could never cease to be and hence there could be no cause for its cessation, which means that there would be no cessation of birth. The 'Means of Cognition' bearing upon the subject matter of the above tend to indicate that *birth is due to Karma*, and in this they are helped (have their validity established) by the above *Cogitation* and thus, inasmuch as *Cogitation* serves the purpose of analysing the objects of true knowledge it is regarded as helping in the attaining of true knowledge. *Cogitation*, even though included in the second category, 'Object of Cognition,' is yet enunciated separately, because, along with the 'Means of Cognition' it is of use in Discussion, both in establishing (one's own position) and in demolishing (the position of the opponent).

[G] *Demonstrated Truth* constitutes that true knowledge which is the result of the 'Means of Cognition',* it forms the final aim of all Discussion and Discussion is aided by Disputation and Wrangling. It is the last two categories of *Cogitation* and *Demonstrated Truth* that carry on all the business of the world, and it is for this reason that, though included in the 'object of cognition', *Demonstrated Truth* has been enunciated separately.

[H] *Discussion* consists in a number of sentences (or declarations) put forward by various speakers purporting to be reasons in support of several theories, leading ultimately to the acceptance of one of these theories as the 'demonstrated truth', and it has

* The *Tātparya* points out that it is the Factors of reasoning that are meant here by 'Means of Cognition', as it is only in them that we have all the Means of Cognition along with *Cogitation*. But it adds that in reality *Demonstrated Truth* is that true knowledge which is led up to by *Cogitation* and therefore *Demonstrated Truth* should be regarded as the result of Perception and all the other Means of Cognition, as aided by *Cogitation*.

been enunciated separately for the purpose of indicating its distinctive features; as it is only when it is carried on in accordance with its distinctive characteristics that it leads to the ascertainment of truth

[I and J] *Disputation* and *Wrangling* are different forms of Discussion, they are different from *Discussion proper* [inasmuch as *Disputation* admits of the use of *Casuistry* etc., which are not allowed in *Discussion*, and *Wrangling* does not tend to the *establishing* of any position, which forms the main purpose of *Discussion*], and they have been enunciated separately, because they help in the guarding of the *knowledge of truth* once attained (by means of *Discussion*) [see Sū 4 2. 50]

[K] *Fallacious Reasons* are in reality included among the *Clinchers* (the sixteenth category), but they have been enunciated separately, because from among the 'Clinchers', it is these that can be put forward or indicated in *Discussions*,—the other 'clinchers' being indicatable only in *Disputations* and *Wranglings*.

[L, M and N] *Casuistry*, *Futile Rejoinder* and *Clinchers* have been enunciated separately, for the purpose of showing what they are, as it is only when the real character of these has been shown that these can be avoided by one in his own assertions, and urged with force against the assertions of others, and also when an *opponent* has recourse to *Casuistry*, it can be easily refuted and also easily made use of [indicated and explained to the Umpire, only when its real character is known]*

[Recapitulation of the Introductory Sūtra—Importance of the Sūtra]

The aforesaid *Science of Reasoning* dealing as it does with the *Means of Right Cognition* and the other Categories,—

'is the lamp of all Sciences, the Means (of the Knowledge) of all things it is the basis of all activities and as such it has been expounded at the very outset (of all scientific investigation)'

As regards the 'knowledge of truth' and 'attainment of highest good' (spoken of in the Sūtra), it must be borne in mind that there is such 'knowledge' and such 'attainment' dealt with in (and

* Thus then it has been shown that *Doubt* and the other categories, even though included in the first two categories, have been separately enunciated with a view to indicate the subjects dealt with in the *Science of Reasoning*

pertaining specifically to) each of the four Sciences (or branches of knowledge), in its own peculiar manner. In the Science we are dealing with here the Science of the Soul (Logic Metaphysics), which forms the 'knowledge of truth', is the knowledge of the Soul and the other objects of cognition, and the 'attainment of highest good' is the obtaining of Release.

Sūtra 2

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Question— 'Does the Highest Good appear immediately after 'true knowledge' ? '

Answer—No, after 'true knowledge'—

Sūtra 2

There is cessation of each member of the following series— Pain Birth, Activity, Defect and Wrong Notion—the cessation of that which follows bringing about the annihilation of that which precedes it and this ultimately leads to the Highest Good—

BHĀṢYA

(A) Of 'Wrong Notion' (mentioned in the *Sūtra* as the first to cease after the attainment of true knowledge) there are various kinds, pertaining as it does to the several objects of cognition beginning with 'Soul' and ending with 'Highest Good' (a) With reference to the *Soul*, the 'Wrong Notion' is in the form 'there is no such thing as Soul',—(b) with regard to the *Not-Soul*, people have 'Wrong Notion' when it is regarded as the 'Soul',—(c) when *pain* is regarded as pleasure, we have the 'Wrong Notion' of *pain*, and so on, (d) when the *non-eternal* is regarded as *eternal*, there is 'wrong notion' of *eternal*, (e) when *non-safety* is regarded as *safety* there is 'wrong notion' of *non-safety* (f) when the *fearful* is regarded as *free from fear* there is 'wrong notion' of *fearful*—(g) when the *disgusting* is regarded as *agreeable* there is 'wrong notion' of *Disgusting*,—(h) when that which deserves to be *rejected* is regarded as worthy of *not being rejected* there is 'wrong notion' of what *should be rejected*, (i) when with regard to *activity*, we have such notions as 'there is no such thing as *Karma*, nor any result of *Karma* there is 'wrong notion' of *activity*' (j) when with regard to *Defects* we have the notion that metempsychosis is not due to 'defects' there

is 'wrong notion' of *defects*,—(h) with regard to *Re Birth* (i.e., Transmigration) we have such *wrong notions* as—'there is no such thing as an animal or a living being, or a being or soul, who could die, or, having died, could be born again,' 'the birth of living beings is without cause,' 'the cessation of birth is without cause' 'Transmigration has beginning, but no end,' 'even though caused, Transmigration cannot be due to *Karma* it consists only in the disruption (at death) and restoration (at rebirth) of the chain of such things as the body, the sense organs, the Consciousness and sensation',—(l) with regard to *Highest Good* we have such *wrong notions* as 'it is something terrible, involving as it does the cessation of all activity,' 'in the *Highest Good* which consists in dissociation from all things, we lose much that is desirable,' 'how can any sane person have any longing for such *Good*, in which there is neither pleasure nor pain nor any consciousness at all?'

(B) From the above described *Wrong Notion* proceeds attachment to the agreeable and aversion for the disagreeable and under the influence of this attachment and aversion, there appear the *Defects*,—such as envy, jealousy, deceit, avarice and the like

(C) Urged by these *Defects*, when the man acts, he commits such misdeeds as—(a) killing, stealing, illicit intercourse, and such other acts pertaining to the body, (b) lying rude talking and incoherent babbling,—these pertaining to speech, (c) malice, desire for things belonging to others, and materialism,—these pertaining to the mind. Such misdeeds constitute the *Wrong* or *Sinful Activity* which tends to *Adharma* (Vice, Demerit) The right sort of *Activity* consists in the following actions—(a) with the body,—charity, protecting and service, (b) with speech,—telling the truth, saying what is wholesome and agreeable, studying the *Veda*, (c) with the mind,—compassion, entertaining no desire for the belongings of other people, and faith, this right *Activity* tends to *Dharma* (Virtue, Merit)

What are meant by 'activity' (*pravṛtti*) in this connection (in the *Sūtra*) are the *results* of activity, in the form of Merit and Demerit, just as life being the result of food, we speak of the life or living beings as 'food'

(D) The 'Activity' described above (in the form of Merit and Demerit) becomes the cause of mean and respectable *birth* (respectively), and *Birth* consists in the collective appearance (in one congregated group) of the Body, the Sense-organs and the Consciousness

(E) When there is *birth*, there is *Pain*, it is that which is felt as disagreeable, and is also known by such names as '*bādhana*' (harrassment), *piḍā* (suffering) and *tāpa* (affliction)

The above five categories, beginning with *Wrong Notion* and ending with *Pain*,* when functioning contiguously (without break) constitute Metempsychosis, Transmigration

When 'true knowledge' is attained 'wrong notions' disappear, on the disappearance of 'wrong notions' the 'defects' disappear, the disappearance of 'defects' is followed by the disappearance of 'activity' (merit and demerit), when there is no activity there is no 'birth', on the cessation of birth there is cessation of pain, cessation of pain is followed by Final Release which is the 'highest good'

What is 'true knowledge' is explained by the contrary of the 'wrong notions' indicated above. For instance, (a) the 'true knowledge', with regard to the *Soul* is in the form 'there is such a thing as Soul,'—(b) that with regard to the 'not Soul,' is in the form 'the not-soul is not the Soul,'—similarly with regard to (c) *pain*, (d) the *eternal*, (e) *safety* (f) the *fearful*, (g) the *disgusting* and (h) the *rejectable*, we have 'true knowledge' when each is known in its real character —(i) with regard to *activity* it is in the form 'there is such a thing as *karma*, and it is effective in bringing about results', (j) with regard to *defects* it is in the form 'Transmigration is due to defects'—(k) with regard to *Rebirth* it is in the form 'there is such a thing as an animal a living being, a being, a soul, which, having died, is reborn—birth has a definite cause,—the cessation of birth has a definite cause—Death Rebirth is without beginning, but ends in Final Release—Death Rebirth having a cause, is caused by activity (merit and demerit),—Death birth is connected with the soul and operates through disruption and restoration of the continuous connection of such things as the body, the sense-organs, the consciousness

* The order of these as given in the *Sūtra* has been altered here. See *Vārtika*]

and sensation,'—(1) with regard to Final Release, it is in the form 'Final Release' involving dissociation from all things and cessation from all activity, is extremely peaceful,—much that is painful, frightful and sinful disappears on Final Release,—and how can any sane person fail to have a longing for it, being, as it is, free from all pain and, entirely devoid of all consciousness of pain? Final Release must be free not only from *pain*, but from *pleasure* also, because all pleasure is invariably connected with some pain, and as such should be avoided in the same manner as food mixed with honey and poison is avoided

Lecture 2

Definition of Pramānas

*The Science of Reasoning proceeds by three processes — *enunciation*, *definition* and *examination*. *Enunciation* is the mere mention by name of the categories, *Definition* consists in that character or property which serves to differentiate that which has been enunciated, and *Investigation* is the examination by means of argumentation, of the question as to whether or not the definition is applicable to the thing defined

†In some cases, the *definition* is stated after the thing has

* We have explained in what manner the true knowledge of Pramāna etc., is related to the Highest Good. After this the following thought might occur to the enquirer — Everyone understands what *Pramāna* and the rest mean and this knowledge would be enough to dispel ignorance and bring Final Release: what then is the necessity of proceeding with this treatise any further? It is in anticipation of this feeling that the Bhasya adds this Introduction: the sense of which is that the mere mention of the categories cannot suffice for true knowledge, for which correct definition and thorough investigation are necessary

† It having been declared that Sutra 3 contains the classification of Pramānas it might be asked why we have this classification before we have been told what Pramāna is: *sc.* before Pramāna has been defined. In anticipation of this the Bhasya proceeds to explain that it is by no means necessary that in every case a regular definition must precede the classification: in some cases we have the definition of a thing after it has been classified, while in others definition precedes classification. As regards this particular Sutra it may be noted that while really propounding the classification of Pramānas it also implies the definition of Pramāna: inasmuch as the word '*pramānas*' in the Sutra serves the purpose of indicating the characteristic features of Pramānas and *definition* is nothing more than the indication of such features

been enunciated and classified,—e.g., in the case of '*Pramāna*' and '*Prameya*'; while in other cases, the *classification* is mentioned after the thing has been enunciated and defined; e.g., in the case of Perverse Reasoning, we find the classification in *Sūtra* 1-2-11, while the enunciation and definition are given in *Sūtra* 1-2-10.

In the following *Sūtra* we have the classification (or enumeration) of *Pramānas*, which have been enunciated in *Sūtra* 1*

Preliminary Survey of the Pramānas

Sūtra 3

Perception Inference, Analogy and Words are the *Pramānas*
BHĀṢYA

(A) *Perception* consists in the operation† of each sense-organ upon a particular object, this 'operation' being in the form either of *contact* or of *cognition*, when it is in the form of *contact* then the 'result' is in the form of *cognition* or *right knowledge*; and when the 'operation' is in the form of *cognition* the 'result' is in the form of the idea of the thing being discarded or elected or treated with indifference (disregarded)‡

(B) *Inference* consists in the consequential cognition, of the object, the *probandum*—possessed of the 'indicative feature,'—obtained through the agency of this indicative feature duly recognised‡

* This enumeration being a form of 'Enunciation' the *three foldness* of the Scientific process is not violated

† In every cause that property of it which is the immediate precursor of the effect is called its 'operation', e.g., when the yarns bring into existence the cloth the 'operation' consists in the final conjunction of the yarns. In the case in question, when the sense-organs bring about Right Cognition their 'operation' would be in the form of their contact with the object cognised, and when the result brought about by the sense-organs consists in the idea leading ultimately to the object being rejected etc., then their 'operation' would be in the form of the *cognition* itself which is the immediate precursor of the said idea.

‡ By the epithet *duly recognised*, all fallacious reasons are excluded. The word '*artha*' here stands, not for object in general, but that object which forms the *probandum* of the inference that which forms the predicate of the conclusion, the *Tatparjya* explains '*artha*' as '*arthate sadhyate yat*—that which is intended to be proved by means of the inference.

(C) *Analogy** consists in the cognition of approximation, by 'approximation' here is meant *the presence of common properties, i.e., similarity* e.g., 'as the cow so is this animal, gavaya'

(D) *Word* is that by which the objects are signified, or denoted, or made known

* That the *Pramānas* are *means of cognising things* is indicated by the literal signification of the constituent factors of the name '*pramāna*', that is to say, the word '*pramāna*', consisting as it does of the root '*mā*' with the preposition '*pra*' and the instrumental verbal affix '*lyut*', its literal signification comes to be '*pramiyate anena*', 'that by the instrumentality of which things are rightly cognised', and the names of the particular *pramānas* also are similarly explained†

Question — 'Have the *Pramānas* their objectives in common? or is the scope of the *Pramānas* restricted within mutually exclusive limits?'

Answer.—As a matter of fact, we find both ways of functioning among *Pramānas*. For instance, in the case of Soul we find that—(a) it is by means of *Word* that we come to know that the Soul exists,—(b) we find *Inference* operating upon it, when it is asserted that 'the indicative marks of the Soul are desire, aversion, effort, pleasure, pain and consciousness' (*Sūtra* 1 1 10) [which means that it is from the presence of these latter that the existence of the Soul is to be *inferred*],—and (c) the Soul is also *perceived* by a peculiar contact of the Soul with the mind, this *Perception* being the result of mystic trance, and as such possible only for the Mystic [Thus Soul is an object which is operated upon by all the *Pramānas*].—Similarly in the case of fire, we find that—(a) when a trustworthy person says 'there is fire at such and such a place', we have the cognition of fire by means of *Word*,—(b) drawing nearer to the place, if we happen to see smoke issuing, we *infer* from this, the existence of fire —(c) actually getting at the place, we directly *see* the fire. On the other hand, in the case of certain things we find that one thing is amenable to only one particular *Pramāna*, as for example, that 'the *Agnihotra* should be

* This definition pertains to the *Means* of analogical cognition, and not to analogical cognition itself

† '*Anumana*'—*anumiyate anena*, '*Upamāna*'—*upamiyate anena* *Śabda*'—*labdyate anena*

performed by one desiring¹ heaven', we can know only by the Words of the Veda; the ordinary man of the world does not know of any indicative features of Heaven (by means of which he could have an *inferential* cognition), nor is he able to *perceive* it directly,—similarly when we hear the sound of thunder, from this, we *infer* the source of the sound, and in regard to this we can have no Perception, nor any Verbal Cognition,—lastly of our own hand we, have a direct *Perception*, and no *Inference* or *Word* is operative in this case.

Among the four kinds of Cognition, *Perception* is the most important, because when a man seeks the knowledge of a certain thing, if he is told of it by a trustworthy person, and thereby he has the *verbal* cognition of the thing, there is still a desire in his mind to ratify his information by means of *Inference* through particular indicative features, and even after he has been able to get at the inferential knowledge of the thing, he is still desirous of actually seeing the thing with his eyes, but when he has once *perceived* the thing directly, his desires are at rest, and he does not seek for any other kind of knowledge*, the examples already cited above (the cases of Soul and Fire) serve to make this point clear, for instance, when the man has to know fire, if several *pramanas* come to bear upon it (as shown above) there is a commingling of the *Pramānas* (in which case all longing for knowledge does not cease until the appearance of direct Perception), whereas if there is a single *Pramāna* bearing upon the thing there is no commingling, but separate functioning [and in this case also it is found that it is only Perception that fully satisfies the inquisitive mind]

[HERE ENDS THE TRISŪTRI-BHĀŚYA]

Of the Instruments of Right Cognition enumerated above the author proceeds to supply definitions—

SENSE-PERCEPTION

Sūtra 4

Sense-perception is that cognition—(a) which is produced by the contact of the object with the sense-organ—(b) which

* This shows that while the other *Pramānas* are not sufficient to allay all desire for knowledge, it is Perception alone which is self sufficient hence its predominance

is not expressible (by words)—(c) which is not erroneous,—and (d) which is well-defined.

BHĀṢYA

(a) That cognition which is produced by the contact of the Sense-organ with the object cognised is *Sense perception*.

An objection is raised against this—"If such is the definition of Sense-perception, then it is not right to hold (as the Logician does) that (in all Perceptions) the Soul is in contact with the Mind, the Mind with the Sense-organ, and the Sense-organ with the cognised Object, [because the *Sūtra* lays down only the contact of the Sense organ with the Object as the necessary condition of Perception]"

Our answer is that the declaration in this *Sūtra* is not meant to be an exhaustive enumeration of all the factors that enter into the cause of Sense-perception, it does not mean that what is here mentioned is the only cause of Sense-perception, all that it does is to indicate that factor which pertains to Sense-perception exclusively, and which distinguishes it from all other forms of cognition; and it omits to mention the other factors (e. g. the contact of the Soul with the Mind, and so on), not because these agencies are not present in Sense-perception, but because they are common to Inference and other forms of cognition also

"Even so, it should be necessary to mention the contact of the Mind with the Sense-organ [which is a factor that is present in Sense-perception only, and in no other form of cognition]."

**The contact of the mind with the sense organ is not mentioned*

* The *Vārtika* supplies two explanations of this sentence —(1) The Mind-organ contact is as good a distinctive feature of Perception as the organ-object contact—this is what is meant by '*samānotādi*', but the *Sūtra* does not make it its business to point out all its distinctive features; one is quite enough to differentiate it from all other forms of cognition. The meaning of the sentence would, in this case, be as presented in the translation.

(2) The second explanation is that the *Sūtra* mentions only the organ object contact because this forms the distinctive feature of every individual perception; when one perception differs from another, the difference does not consist in mind-organ contact; i. e. individual perceptions are never-spoken of in terms of mind-organ contact. In this latter case it is difficult to explain the word '*samānotādi*', the explanation given by the *Vārtika* being forced. The *Vārtika* does not pronounce itself in favour of any one of the two interpretations; in the concluding statement it mentions both.

It is remarkable that the *Tātparya* notices the latter interpretation only.

urge that—"all *doubtful cognition* is produced by the contact of the Soul with the Mind [and *not* by the contact of the sense organ with the object], so that the doubtful cognition would be precluded by the first word of the definition, and for the exclusion of such cognition it would not be necessary to have a further qualification",—because as a matter of fact, it is when one sees the object with his eyes [when there is contact of the object with the eye] that he has a doubtful cognition with regard to it [in the form—'this object that I see is this smoke or dust'] * then again, just as in all cases of Perception, when a man apprehends the object with his sense organ, he perceives it also with his mind, so also when he has the doubtful cognition of a thing through his sense organ, he has the same cognition through his mind also [which shows that in such cases the doubtful cognition, though brought about by the mind, is dependent upon a sense-operation] and it is this latter kind of cognition which is brought about by the mind through the agency of the organ—and which has this additional qualification [over the doubtful cognition, produced by the mind alone by its contact with the Soul]—which is meant to be referred to here by the name 'doubtful' and not the former kind of doubtful cognition [mentioned by the opponent as that which is brought about by the contact of the Soul with the mind independently of the operation of the senses] † Thus then in reality, in all cases of Sense perception, the Sense organ of the perceiver is invariably operative, and the operation of the Mind comes in only subsequently, for purposes of the representative cognition (which recalls the third cognition previously got at through the senses), that this is so is proved by the fact that there is no representative cognition for those*whose

to Non determinate Perception only. It would seem that the Buddha definition of Perception as *Kalpanāpadham*—*abstraction*—were a true rendering of Vātsyāyana's view. The Vārtika also when refuting the Buddha definition, directs its attack only to the presence of the word '*Kalpana*'

* Which shows that *all* doubtful cognitions are not independent of sense-operation even though there are some that are due to the operation of the Mind alone

† Thus there being many doubtful cognitions brought about by the contact of the sense-organ with the object a further qualification was necessary for the exclusion of these

object), there is no such contact of it (with the other objects), which shows that the operation of the Mind is necessary in every act of perception —and all this goes to prove that the Mind is a 'sense organ', and this obviates the necessity of providing another definition (of Perception, for including the perception of the Soul, &c.) Then again [even though the *Sūtra* does not mention the *Mind* among the 'sense organs'], the fact that the *Mind* is a 'sense-organ' can be learnt from another philosophical system (the *Vaiśeṣika*), and it is a rule with all systems that those doctrines of other systems which are not directly negatived are meant to be accepted as true *

Thus has Sense perception been defined

INFERENCE

Sūtra 5

† After Perception comes Inferential Cognition § which is led up to by Perception it is of three kinds—(1)** the *Pūrvavat*, (2) the *Śesavat* and (3) the *Sāmānyatodṛṣṭa* ††

BHĀṢYA

The expression 'led up to by Perception' refers to the perception of the relation between the *probans* and the *probandum* as also to the perception of the *probans* itself and the perception of the relation between the *probans* and the *probandum* also implies the remembrance of the *probans* and thus it is by means of remembrance and perception of the *probans* that the non perceptible thing is inferred §§

* Dinnāga the Buddhist Logician has objected to this declaration in his *Pramāṇasamuccaya* remarking if silence was the proof of assent why did the Nyaya *Sūtra* not remain silent regarding the other five sense organs also? (See S C Vidyābhūṣana *Indian Logic*—pp 85-81 footnote)

† This is how the *Tatparjya* explains the word *atha*

§ The *Vartika* expands this into—that which is preceded by other forms of valid cognition and by two perceptions

** These are technical names of which the *Bhāṣya* supplies two different meanings. Hence the names are left untranslated

†† Another interpretation of the *Sūtra* has been proposed by the *Vartika*

§§ We see the fire and smoke together—this is one perception—that of the relation between fire and smoke—after some time we see the smoke—this is the second perception—on seeing the smoke we remember the relation that we had perceived, and this leads us to the inference of fire—the unperceived member of the relation

I [The first explanation of the three kinds of Inference]

—(A) the *Pūrvavat* Inference is that in which the effect is inferred from the cause;* e g when we see clouds rising, we infer that there will be rain (B) The *S'esavat* Inference is that in which the cause is inferred from the effect,† e g, when we see that the water of the river is not like what it used to be, and that the stream is fuller and the current swifter, we infer that there has been rain (C) The *Sāmānyatodrsta* Inference [is that in which the inference is based upon a general observation], e g, we have observed in all cases that we see a thing in a place different from where we saw it before only when it has moved and from this fact of general observation we infer that the sun must be moving, even though we cannot perceive it (because we see the sun in the evening in a place different from where we saw it in the morning)

II [Another explanation of the three kinds of Inference]

Or, we may explain the three names in the following manner —

(A) The *Pūrvavat* Inference is that in which out of two things as perceived on some former occasion, the one that is not perceived (at the time of inference) is inferred from the preception of the other. e g, when fire is inferred from smoke §

(B) The word '*S'esavat*' means remainder, with regard to an object, there are certain possibilities—and some of these possibilities are eliminated, and there being no other possibilities—when the remaining possibility is cognised in relation to the said object, this cognition is *S'esavat* || e g, in regard to Sound, we find that it is an entity and is transient, and as these two properties (being an entity and being transient) are found to be common to Substances, Qualities and Actions only, their presence in Sound distinguishes it from the remaining categories of Community, Individuality and Inherence (all of which three are entities, but eternal) —, then there arising a doubt as to Sound being either a Substance, or a Quality, or an Action, we reason (by a process of

* The cause is 'pūrva' or prior to the effect, hence that in which the inference is based upon the cognition of the cause has been called *Pūrvavat* or a *priori*

† The effect being '*S'esa* or posterior' to the Cause

§ The *Pūrvavat* inference would thus be *Inference per Prior Perception*

|| The *S'esavat* inference would thus be *Inference per Elimination*

elimination) in the following manner —(a) Sound cannot be a Substance, because it inheres in a single substance (*Ākāśa*) [while there is no Substance which inheres in only one substance, all substances being either not inherent in any substance —e g, the atoms,—or inherent in more than one substance,—e g, the jar, which inheres in more than one atom] —(b) Sound is not an Action, because it is the originator of another sound [it thus gives rise to something that is of its own kind, and this is never the case with any Action, which always brings about effects that are entirely unlike itself,—e g, Action, in most cases, produces some kind of conjunction or disjunction],—and by this eliminative reasoning we come to the conclusion that Sound must be a Quality (this being the only member of the three that is not eliminated) *

(C) The *Sāmānyatodrsta* Inference is that in which, the relation between the *probans* and the *probandum* being imperceptible, the imperceptible *probandum* is inferred from the similarity of the *probans* to something else e g when the Soul is inferred from Desire,—Desire is a Quality, and Qualities always inhere in Substances, and (from this similarity of Desire to other qualities we come to the conclusion that Desire must inhere in a Substance) and this leads to the inference that that Substance in which Desire inheres is the Soul

It is true that the fact of there being three kinds of Inference is sufficiently indicated by the enunciation of the three kinds, and hence the additional word '*trividham*,' 'it is of three kinds,' in the *Sūtra* could well have been left out,—but this additional curtailment of the *Sūtra* was not considered desirable by the author of the *Sūtra*, as he thought that he had secured sufficient conciseness in expressing by means of the short *Sūtra* the entire extent of the vast subject of Inference. This method of explanation—of being satisfied with one form of conciseness and not minding other possible forms—is often employed by the author of the *Sūtra*, as we find in the case of his descriptions of the various kinds of '*Siddhānta*,' '*Chala*,' '*Śabda*' and so forth

* This example of *Seṣavat* Inference is not accepted by the *Tatparjya*—*Pariseṣa* is only another name for the purely negative inference, while the example cited by the *Bhāṣya* is one of the affirmative negative kind. The example suggested is the inference of the fact of 'Desire' etc, being dependent upon the Soul

[The difference between Perception and Inference is that] Perception pertains to things present, while Inference pertains to things present as well as not present (*i. e.* past and future) 'How so?' As a matter of fact, Inference is applicable to all the three points of time by means of Inference we apprehend things past, present and future for instance, we infer (a) that 'such and such a thing *will happen*',—(b) that 'such and such a thing is present',—and also (c) that 'such and such a thing existed in the past' The past and the future are 'not present' [hence we speak of Inference as pertaining to the *present* as well as to the *not present*]

ANALOGY

Analogy is next considered—

Sutra 6

* Analogy is that which accomplishes its purpose through similarity to a known object

BHĀṢYA

† That is Analogy is that which makes known what is to be made known through similarity to an object that is already well

* The confused use of the word *pramāṇa* continues. We have seen that *Pratyakṣa* has been defined as the *cognition* that is brought about by sense contact etc. and here we find *Upamāṇa* being defined as that which accomplishes the purpose of making known — *i. e.* a means of cognition.

† There is some difference between the *Bhāṣya* on the one hand and the *Vārtika* and the *Tatparyā* on the other. As regards the object of analogical cognition and the exact *form* of that cognition there is no difference as according to both the object is the connection of the name with the object the form of the cognition being this object is what is named *gavaya*. There is however a marked difference of opinion as to the *means* of the cognition that it is the similarity between the two objects that is the means on this also all are agreed but according to the *Bhāṣya* it is this similarity as expressed in the assertion the *gavaya* is like the cow — which assertion is remembered at the time that the man sees the animal resembling the cow while according to the *Vārtika* and the *Tatparyā* it is the similarity that is actually seen when the animal is seen to resemble the cow — the perceived similarity being aided by the remembrance of the similarity expressed in the assertion the *gavaya* is like the cow. Says the *Parasuddhi* मादृश्यस्त्वेव प्रज्ञायमानस्य करणत्वमभिप्रेति ।

The *Tatparyā* interprets the *Bhāṣya* passage '*yatha gauḥ tathā gavayaḥ*' (II 1 2) to mean that the similarity should be one that is already known

known, e.g. the assertion 'as the cow so the *gavaya*' [i.e. the animal called '*gavaya*' is like the cow]

"What is it that is accomplished by this *analogy*?"

When a person finds similarity to the cow, he actually perceives the object that had been referred to in the *analogy*, and thence he comes to cognise the connection of that object with the name mentioned in that *Analogy*, so that it is this latter cognition that is the purpose accomplished by *Analogy*. For instance, when the *Analogy*, in the form 'the animal called *gavaya* is like the cow', has been put forward,—and the man who has heard this happens, subsequently, to perceive through the contact of his sense-organs, an object similar to the cow,—he realises that 'the word *gavaya* is the name of this object', and comes to cognise the connection of that particular name with that particular object. Similarly in the case of such analogies as 'the *mudgaparni* is similar to the *mudga*', 'the *masaparni* is similar to the *māsa*'—being put forward, the observer, by means of these analogies, comes to know the connection of the particular names with the particular objects, and thereby obtains the particular herb (*mudga parni* or *māsaparni*) that he requires. In the same manner we can explain other objects of *Analogy* met with in common experience.

WORD

We now proceed to describe the *Word* [as an Instrument of Right Cognition]—

Sūtra 7

The assertion* of a reliable person is 'word'

by means of such assertions. But we find (in 1.4) the *Bhāṣya* calling this assertion itself '*Upamāna*'.

There is no doubt that the view of the *Varṇika* and the *Tātparyya* is more logical. The latter rightly remarks that for the cognition that 'this animal is what is called *gavaya*' it is necessary that the observer should know of the assertion 'the *gavaya* is similar to the cow' and also that he should perceive the similarity to the cow in the animal concerned. If the analogical cognition had for its means only this remembered similarity, then its validity would be as doubtful as that of the Remembrance itself.

* 'The word *Upadeśa*, standing for words uttered for the benefit of others, here applies to the Sentence as well as to what is expressed by the sentence. When the sentence is regarded as the 'means' of the cognition, the result brought about by it is the knowledge of what is expressed by it, and when this latter is the 'means' the 'result' consists in the idea of acquiring or discarding the thing spoken of.—*Tātparyya*

BHĀṢYA

That person is called 'apta', 'reliable', who possesses the direct and right knowledge of things, who is moved by a desire to make known (to others) the thing as he knows it, and who is fully capable of speaking of it. The word 'apta' is explained as denoting one who acts or proceeds, through 'āpti', i. e. through the direct right knowledge of things. This definition applies to sages, *as well as to *Āryas* and *Mlecchas*, † the activities of all these people are carried on through such 'Words.'

Thus we find that it is by means of the aforesaid four Instruments of Cognition,—and not by any other means—that the activities of Deities, Men and Animals are carried on.

Sutra 8

The said Word is of two kinds—the *Dṛṣṭārtha*, that of which the thing spoken of is perceived, and the *Adṛṣṭārtha*, that of which the thing spoken of is not perceived

BHĀṢYA

That 'Word' of which the thing spoken of is perceived in this world is called '*Dṛṣṭārtha*', while that of which the thing

* 'One who has direct intuitive knowledge of things is a Sage. The name *Ārya* stands for the people of the Central Land (bounded by the Bay of Bengal, the Arabian Sea, the *Vindhya* and the *Himalaya*). And the residents of the rest of the world are called *Mlecchas*.'

† There are cases where the word of the worst man is true and reliable. For instance, after a robber has taken away all that a traveller possessed, if he is asked to point out the way to a certain place, what he indicates does turn out to be the right path. The word of such people is reliable only when they have no motive for giving incorrect information. Hence for being an 'apta', for the purposes of the validity of his assertions, it is not necessary that he should be completely free from all defects, as has been asserted by some philosophers.—*Tātparya*

On this the *Parīśuddhi* observes as follows.—There are two kinds of persons—omniscient and not-omniscient, of these, the unreliability of the former is set aside by the very proof that establishes his existence, as the person who is proved to be omniscient is also proved to be free from all defects of ignorance, love, hatred and the like. As for the not-omniscient person, his assertions can bear testimony to his being reliable by reason of his being possessed of—(a) due knowledge of the thing spoken of, (b) desire to convey true information, (c) efficient faculty of right articulation etc., and one can be sure of this only after having repeatedly found the man to be possessed of these qualities.

spoken of is only believed to exist in the other world is '*Adrstārtha*'* These are the two divisions under which are included all the assertions of sages and ordinary men

"For what purpose does the Sūtra mention these two divisions?"

This mention is made so that the other party may not think that what is a *valid instrument of cognition* is only that *assertion of the reliable person* which speaks of things that are directly perceived, as it is only such things that can be duly ascertained This idea had to be guarded against, as such assertions also as speak of things not seen are *valid Instruments of cognition*, as such things also can be duly ascertained by means of Inference †

Here ends the section of the Bhāṣya dealing with the Instruments of Cognition

Lecture 3

The Prameyas

[*The Objects of Cognition*]

The Sūtra now proceeds to explain what is to be known by means of the above described Instruments of Cognition

* (1) That which speaks of things directly perceived by the Speaker, and (2) That which speaks of things only known to him indirectly by means of Inference for instance

† If only Words speaking of visible things were reliable then the Veda would become excluded Hence it is added that words speaking of invisible things also are reliable Such invisible things as Heaven and the like can be known by means of Words whose validity can be ascertained only by means of an Inference based upon the fact of their being the Word of a reliable person,—i.e. God And it is for this reason that these things are said to be inferred This precludes the validity of mere Hearsay, or of the word of persons whose veracity cannot be correctly inferred, e.g. that of Buddha and others And it does not mean that the things spoken of in this case are those that cannot be cognised by means of Perception As Heaven etc. are actually perceived by the sages When the ordinary man speaks of Heaven etc. his words are *adṛṣṭārtha* in a double sense—the thing is one cognisable only by means of words whose validity can be only inferred and the man speaks of things that he has not seen but knows by means of words whose reliability he knows from Inference It is on the basis of this double sense of '*adṛṣṭārtha*' that we find the *Vārtika* offering a second interpretation of the words '*adṛṣṭārtha*' and '*adṛṣṭārtha*'—*Tatparya*

Sūtra 9

Soul, Body, Sense-organs, Things, Apprehension Mind Activity, Defect, Re-birth, Fruition, Pain, and Ultimate Good really* constitute the Objects of Cognition

Of these—(1) the Soul is the perceiver (of all that brings about pain and pleasure),—the experiencer (of all pains and pleasures)—the knower of all (pains, pleasures and their causes)—who attains all things.† (2) The Body is the receptacle of the Soul's experiences (3) The sense-organs are the instruments of the experiences, (4) The Things are the objects to be enjoyed and experienced (5) Apprehension consists of the experience itself (6) § The Mind is that internal organ which is capable of bringing about the apprehension of all things,—which the Sense organs (being limited in their scope) cannot do (7) Activity is the cause of the propagation of the body, the sense-organs, the thing and the sensing of pleasure and pain (8) So also are the Defects (9) Rebirth,—the body that belongs to the Soul in one life is not the first that the Soul has had, nor is it the last, in fact there can be no 'first' in the previous bodies that the soul has had [as we cannot trace the beginning of the worldly process], and as for its subsequent bodies there can be an end to these only when Ultimate Good is attained —and it is this that constitutes Rebirth (10) Fruition consists in the experiencing of pleasure and pain along with the causes leading to these (11) Pain—by the special mention of 'pain' (and the omission of 'pleasure') it is not meant that there is no pleasure at all—which is what is actually felt as agreeable [just as much as Pain is felt as disagreeable] what is

* According to the *Parīṣuddhi* there are two readings in the *Sūtra*—one with 'tu', and the other without it. We shall see later on how this particle is essential.

† If the Soul did not attain all things it could not know 'all things'.

§ The point in which the Soul differs from the other objects is that it is only as the experiencer of pleasures and pains that the Soul is something to be got rid of (*heya*) in its own positive form, it is never *heya*, it is always, *upādaya*, to be acquired and treasured, while all the rest—except Ultimate Good are always only fit to be got rid of, and Ultimate Good is always to be acquired and treasured.

§ There is much uncertainty on the exact nature of *manas*. The later Logicians regard it as an *indriya*, while the *Bhāṣya* is not clear on this point. We shall deal with this subject later on, under 'Manas'.

meant is to lay stress upon the teaching that it is desirable that one should practise the thoughtful contemplation of the fact that Pleasure also is only a form of Pain,—being as it is, along with its causes, found to always end in pain, to be never also entirely free from pain and to be inseparable from various difficulties, as when one is thoughtful and contemplates upon the said fact, he becomes disgusted,—thus disgust makes him free from all attachment, and brings Dispassion—and having become dispassionate, he attains the Ultimate Good, Emancipation (12) Ultimate Good or Emancipation consists in the cessation of the series of births and deaths, and the consequent disappearance of all pain

Though apart from these enumerated, there are many other 'objects of cognition' also—such as Substance, Quality, Action, Community Individuality and Inherence,—yet it would be impossible to enumerate all such objects severally, so what the Sutra has done is to make specific mention of only those 'objects' whose right knowledge brings Emancipation and wrong knowledge leads to Birth and Rebirth [and it does not mean that these are the only objects that can be cognised]

Soul—The First Prameya

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

* As a matter of fact, it is found that the Soul is not apprehended by Perception, the question then arises as to whether it is known only by means of 'reliable assertion' The answer is that it is not so, as Soul is cognised by means of Inference also — "How so?"

* 'That there is such a thing as Soul is known in a general way, from Reliable Assertion (of the Veda, for instance), and this knowledge is ratified by Inference — *Tātparyā* 'By being ratified is meant that the vague general cognition is specified — says the *Parīśuddhi* That is the existence of particular souls in particular bodies becomes recognised

In connection with the opening sentence of the *Bhāṣya*, the objection is raised as to why the perception of the Soul is denied when as a matter of fact, the Soul is always an object of mental perception, being always perceived as 'I', a conception that appears along with every cognition. The answer to this is that it is true that we have the notion of 'I', but this might be (and actually is) taken as referring to the body, and as such it could not afford a sufficient proof for the existence of the Soul apart from the body, so long as it is not strengthened and ratified by other means of

Sūtra 10

**Desire, Aversion, Effort, Pleasure, Pain and Cognition
are the indicatives of the Soul**

[A] The Soul having experienced pleasure by coming into contact with a certain kind of things, whenever, in the future, he happens to see a thing of that same kind, he wishes to acquire that thing, and this wish to acquire is possible only in one who, while remaining one and the same, perceives several things, as it arises from his remembrance of a previous perception, it is thus that Desire becomes an indicative (a sign or proof) of the Soul * No such desire would be possible [if there were not one and the same agent to cognise and to recognise the thing, and] if there were only a series of distinct cognitions, each pertaining to its own distinct object, for the recognition of one cognition by another cognition would be as possible as the recognition by one body of the experiences of another body.†

cognition Inference &c This is the answer from the stand point of one who does not regard the Soul as purely perceptible, the answer from the stand point of one who regards Soul as perceptible is that the passage refers to the Soul of others one's own Soul being always perceptible —[as held by some Logicians, called by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, 'śaśvathyaḥ']—*Parisuddhi*

* Having found a certain kind of thing to give pleasure the man formulates the judgment 'this kind of thing gives pleasure',—this is the major premiss when he sees that kind of thing again, he has the idea 'this is that kind of thing', this forms the minor premiss from these two premisses he comes to the conclusion 'this will give pleasure' and then *desires* to acquire that thing. Thus this *Desire* proves that the agent who has this desire must be the same who has the three cognitions represented by the two premisses and the resultant conclusion,—there being a common agent for all the four, if the agent were not the same there could be no such recollection or fusion of the several cognitions involved, and it is this common agent—who is the seer of the thing the experienter of pleasure the rememberer of the thing being the source of pleasure and the desirer of the thing—who is the 'Soul'—*Tatparya*

† This anticipates the following argument —'Even in the absence of a Soul, the recollection and fusion of cognitions would be possible under the hypothesis of every cognition setting up, and forming a factor in a series of cognitions.' If this were so, then every cognition would recall and fuse into every other cognition of the same series. *Tatparya*

The phrase '*dehāntaragat*' is explained by the *Bhāṣya* itself later on.

[B] Similarly it is only when one and the same agent perceives several things, that, on recollecting a previous perception, he comes to have *Aversion* to the thing that has been the cause of pain to him

[C] When a certain kind of thing has been found to be the cause of pleasure, on subsequently seeing a thing of that kind, the man makes an attempt to obtain that thing, and this *Effort* would not be possible if there were not one agent perceiving a number of things and recollecting his past perceptions, specially no such Effort would be possible if there were only a series of distinct cognitions, each pertaining to its own distinct object, for the Effort of one cognition on the basis of the experience of another cognition would be as impossible as the Effort of one body on the basis of the experiences of another body. This explanation also applies to the *Effort* that is put forth for the getting rid of what has been found to be a cause of pain

[D and E] It is only by reason of his remembrance of his previous experience of pleasure and pain that when the man gets by the thing that had caused him pleasure he is pleased, and when he gets by what had caused him pain he feels unhappy and thus it is that he experiences *Pleasure* and *Pain*. And in this also the reason is the same as before [that is to say the said pleasure and pain are possible only when the person getting by the thing and remembering the previous experiences is the same who had had those experiences, and this proves the Soul as the experiencer of Pleasure and Pain in the past their rememberer and their experiencer in the present]

[F] When a man is desirous of knowing or understanding (the real character of a certain thing), at first he ponders over it in the form—'what may this be?', and pondering thus he comes to know it in the form—'this is so and so'. This *Knowing* of the thing is by the same agent as the previous *desire to know* and the consequent *pondering*,—so that this *Knowledge, Cognition*, becomes an indicative of the presence of the common agent in the shape of the 'Soul'. And here also the reason is the same as before

Now we proceed to explain the phrase *dehāntaracat*, 'as in the case of another body', [that we have used twice before] — The philosopher who does not admit the Soul readily admits that

the diverse Cognitions, each pertaining to a distinct object, when appearing in different bodies, are never recognised [and never fuse together, the cognitions of one body not being recognised by another body], and for the same reason the diverse cognitions, appearing in the same body also, could not be recollected, the two cases being for the said philosopher exactly alike, [so far as the absence of the common agent is concerned, there being no such agent in either case] Thus then, with regard to a single agent we find that he recognises only what he has perceived, and not what he has not perceived or what has been perceived by another, similarly with regard to diverse agents also, we find that one agent does not recognise what has been perceived by another, neither of these two well known facts can be adequately explained by the philosopher who does not admit a Soul

Thus it is proved that there is such a thing as Soul

Body—The Second Prameya

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

* The receptacle of the Soul's experiences is—

Sūtra 11

The Body, which is the vehicle of actions, of sense-organs and of objects †

BHĀṢYA

[A] "How is the Body the vehicle of actions?"

With regard to things that the Soul desires to obtain or to discard, there arises in the Soul the desire to obtain, or to discard it respectively, urged by this desire, the Soul puts forth exertion embodying the operation of the means for obtaining or discarding it, and that wherein this exertion appears is the Body

* As the Body is the receptacle of the Soul's experiences of pleasure and pain, it lies at the root of the series of births and rebirths, hence its treatment comes next after the Soul —*Tatparya*

† According to the *Bhāṣya* and the *Vārtika* this Sūtra contains three definitions of the Body—(1) It is the vehicle of the Soul's actions, (2) it is the vehicle of the Soul's sense-organs —(3) it is the vehicle of the Soul's objects. Some philosophers have taken the Sūtra as providing a single definition—'It is the vehicle of actions etc etc' This is rejected by the *Vārtika*

[B] "How is the Body the *vehicle of sense organs* ? "

That thing alone can be regarded as the *vehicle of the sense-organs* by whose benefit the sense-organs are benefited, and by whose injury they are injured,—and it is according to this benefit or injury, that they act upon their objects good and bad,—and such a thing is the *Body*

'How is the Body the *vehicle of objects* ? "

That is to be regarded as the *vehicle of objects* in which receptacle there appear the feelings of pleasure and pain caused by the contact of the sense organs with those objects,—and such a receptacle is the *Body*

The Sense organs—The Third Prameya

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

* The instruments that bring about the experience (of pleasure and pain) are—

Sūtra 12

The Olfactory, the Gestatory the Visual the Cutaneous and the Auditory Organs, proceeding from material substances

BHĀṢYA

That by whose instrumentality one smells things is the Olfactory Organ, so called because it apprehends odour That by whose instrumentality one tastes things is the Gestatory Organ, so called because it apprehends taste That by whose instrumentality one sees things is the Visual Organ so called

* The sense organs being the *presenters* [as they serve to bring before the Soul through the body definite objects which become the source of pleasure and pain—*Parissuddhi*], they differ in this respect from the objects that are *presented* and as such they have to be defined before the Objects. As the *Sūtra* only provides the definitions of the particular organs—and as these particular definitions are not intelligible until we have the definition of Sense-organ in general the *Bhāṣya* in this introductory clause, supplies this general definition. The general definition should have been stated in the form that the sense organs are the instruments by which direct cognitions are brought about but it is with a view to excite disgust against the organs (along with every thing else) that the *Bhāṣya* speaks of them as the instruments of the experience of pleasure and pain —*Tātparjā*

because it apprehends colour That which is located in the skin is the Cutaneous Organ, so called indirectly because of its location * That by whose instrumentality one hears things is the Auditory Organ, so called because it apprehends sound Thus from the force of the literal signification of the names, we learn that the sense-organs are to be defined as the apprehenders of their respective objects

† *Proceeding from material substances*—adds the Sūtra The meaning of this is that it is because the organs proceed from diverse sources (in the shape of the material substances) that they are restricted to particular objects this would not be possible if they all proceeded from a single source [in the shape of the 'self-consciousness' of the Sankhyas] and it is only when each of them is restricted to a particular object that it can be defined as the apprehender of its object

The Material Substances INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

'What are the causes from which the Sense organs proceed?'

Sūtra 13

§ The Material Substances are Earth Water Fire Air, and Ākāśa

* The other organs are named after what is apprehended by them the Cutaneous Organ apprehends the touch of things hence the name Cutaneous Organ applies to it not directly in the sense in which the names of the other organs apply but only indirectly in the sense that the skin is the locus of that organ

† As a matter of fact odour which is the specific quality of Earth is apprehended by the Olfactory Organ only taste the specific quality of Water is apprehended only by the Gustatory Organ and so forth This is so because the Olfactory Organ proceeds from—Earth and the Gustatory Organ of Water If both proceeded from a single source as held by the Sankhyas then we could not account for the aforesaid facts

§ The *Īrtika* and the *Tatparya* do not take any note of this Sūtra but the *Nyayasūtrībandha* has this as an independent Sūtra The *Bhāṣya* also speaks of this as containing the *upadeśa* of the *bhūtas* and this word could have been used only with reference to the words of the *Sītrakara*

BHĀṢYA

Here we find the Material Substances mentioned by their respective names with the view that when they are thus clearly mentioned, it will be easy to point out which Sense organ is the product of which substance

Artha—Things or Objects The Fourth Prameya

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Of the endless objects, the following are those 'objects' [which, when pondered upon as things apprehended by the sense-organs, lead to that dispassion which helps the attainment of Release, and which, when not rightly discerned, become the cause of endless births and rebirths]—

Sūtra 14

* **Odour Taste Colour, Touch and Sound, which are the qualities of Earth [Water, Fire Air, and Ākāśa], are the objects of the aforesaid [sense organs]**

* The translation here follows the interpretation of the *Bhāṣya*. The *Vartika* and the *Tatparya* however do not agree with the view that Odour and the other four qualities alone are perceptible. Hence they interpret the *Sūtra* and the *Bhāṣya* differently. The first difference lies in the following explanation suggested by the *Tatparya*—*Tadarthah* the last word in the *Sūtra* means that which is sought after—i.e. acted upon—by the sense organs, so that this word embodies the definition of the fourth 'object of cognition', 'artha', and the rest of the *Sūtra* is not a definition—it only supplies certain details of information, though not in a precise manner as it is meant for a friendly listener and not for a critical opponent.

The reason why the *Tatparya* had recourse to this explanation of the definition of *artha* lay in the fact that according to the view of the *Vartika*, the *Sūtra* could not be taken as supplying an accurate enumeration of the 'objects of perception', so the precise definition had to be found somewhere in the *Sūtra* and this was found in the word '*tadarthah*'.

The word *prithvyāḥgunah* is taken by the *Vartika* to mean *prithvya dayah*—i.e. 'earth', 'water', 'fire' and 'air'—and *gunah* *gandha* etc. being included in '*gunah*' their separate mention is regarded as another information supplied in a friendly spirit with a view to indicate what is precisely apprehended by each sense-organ.

The great weakness in this explanation of the *Sūtra* is that *Prithvyādī* has to be taken as standing for only three out of five *bhūtas*, while the *gunas* of the other two are as perceptible as those of the other three. It is not

BHĀṢYA

The qualities mentioned, belonging to Earth and the other elementary substances are the 'objects' of the sense organs respectively, in accordance with the actual functioning or operating of the sense-organs

Buddhi—Apprehension The Fifth Prameya

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

* Some people (the Sāṅkhyas) have held the view that *Jñāna* 'Cognition,' is the function of *Buddhi* 'Cosmic Intellect,' which latter is a non intelligent or unconscious instrument, while *Upalabdhi*, 'Apprehension' is the function of the intelligent (Soul) which latter is not active. And our Author makes the following declaration, with a view, it would seem † to set aside this view

easy to see why the *Varṭika* and the *Tātparyā* fought shy of the *Bhāṣya*'s explanation the only reason appears to be that this explanation precludes the perceptibility of the other qualities of *Prthivyādi*—viz number separateness etc

* The Sāṅkhya theory is thus explained in the *Tātparyā*—*Buddhi* is a product of the three *gunas* which are unconscious entities. Hence *Buddhi* also is unconscious. Through the medium of the Sense-organs the *Buddhi* becomes modified into the form of the object. The faculty of consciousness on the other hand is unmodifiable and is ever conscious. When *Buddhi* comes into close proximity to this conscious entity it reflects within itself this consciousness and thereby appears as itself conscious and becoming modified into the form of the object it cognises it hence the modification of the *Buddhi* into the form of the thing cognised completes the cognition of that thing. While the connection of the conscious entity through reflection with the *Buddhi* in the shape of the object cognised constitutes a function of the conscious Soul and is called the 'apprehension of the object by the Soul. Just as the moon though without light of its own reflects the light of the Sun and with this reflected light illumines objects in the same manner *Buddhi*, though itself unconscious reflects the consciousness of the Soul and thereby cognises objects and makes them apprehended.

† *It would seem*—This qualifying clause is added with a view to indicate that this refutation is not the main purpose of the *Sūtra*. The *Sūtra* is for the purpose of providing a definition of *Buddhi* and the way in which the definition is put forward serves also the purpose of setting aside the Sāṅkhya view.

Sūtra 15

'Intellection,' 'Apprehension,' and 'Cognition' are synonymous terms*

BIĀṢYA

It is not possible for Cognition to belong to the unconscious instrument *Buddhi*, as if it were, then *Buddhi* could be a conscious entity, while there is a single conscious entity, apart from the aggregate of the body, and the sense organs † Though the sentence composing the *Sūtra* is for the purpose of providing the definition of one of the *objects of cognition*, yet it is taken as implying the other fact (the refutation of the Sankhya theory) by the force of the argument (implied in the mention of the synonyms) §

Manas—Mind The Sixth Prameya

INTRODUCTORY BIĀṢYA

Remembrance, Inference, Verbal Cognition, Doubt Intuition, Dream, Imagination, as also the Perception of Pleasure etc and Desire and the rest—all these are indicative of the existence of the Mind, and in addition to all these, we have the following also—

Sūtra 16

The non-appearance of simultaneous cognitions is indicative of the existence of Mind

BIĀṢYA

Inasmuch as Remembrance and the rest (enumerated above) are not brought about by the instrumentality of the (external) ‡ sense organs, they must be due to some other organ As a matter of fact, we find that even though at one and the same time several perceptible objects, odour and the rest, are in close proximity to the respectively perceptive sense-organs, the Olfactory organ and

* Thus the definition of *Buddhi* comes to be this—'That thing which is denoted by these synonymous words is *Buddhi*'

† This refutation is thus explained by the *Tatparya*,—*Buddhi* cannot reflect the conscious Soul, in the way that the moon reflects the light of the Sun As consciousness being non-modifiable, there can be no reflection of it Hence it would be necessary to attribute consciousness to the *Buddhi* itself So that every cognition will have two conscious agents

§ Thus explained by the *Paribuddhi*

‡ This qualification is added by the *Tatparya*

the rest, yet there is no simultaneous cognition of them, and from this we infer that there is some other cause, by whose proximity cognition appears, and on account of whose non proximity cognition does not appear,—this other organ being in contact with the several sense-organs and helping them, and being non pervasive (limited) in its dimension. If the proximity of sense-organs to their objects, by themselves, independently of the contact of the Mind, were the sole cause of cognitions, then it would be quite possible for several cognitions to appear simultaneously

Pravṛtti, Activity—The Seventh Prameya

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

After Mind comes the turn* of Activity, and

Sūtra 17

Activity consists in the operating of Speech, of Mind and of Body

BHĀṢYA

By the word 'buddhi' in the Sūtra the Mind is meant—the word being taken in the sense of *that by means of which things are cognised (buddhyate anayā)*†

§ The various 'operatings' by the Body by Speech and by the Mind are righteous and unrighteous, and are of ten kinds. This we have already explained above under Sūtra 2

* As Activity belongs to the Mind (see Sūtra) Activity has to be defined after Mind has been described

† The word *buddhi*, when explained as *buddhyate* its that which is apprehended denotes cognition and when explained as *buddhyate anayā* it denotes the instrument of cognition Mind

§ Says the *Tatparjya*—Operations are of two kinds—some give rise to cognition others give rise to action. For instance the operation of Speech becomes the cause of virtue or sin according to the nature of the cognition that it produces (in the mind of the person spoken to). So that Speech must be taken here to stand for all those operations that bring about cognitions and thus the operations of the Eye and other organs which consist in the perceiving of agreeable or disagreeable things become included. Operations leading to Action are of two kinds—that *having the Body for its cause* and that *caused by the Mind*

These two expressions are explained by the *Paravidhi* to mean—that of which the body is the *object* and that of which the Mind is the *object*. For instance the operation or effort involved in the actions of giving, stealing

*Dosa—Defect—The Eighth Prameya**Sūtra 18*

Defects have urging or inciting for their distinguishing feature

BRĀṢYA

* 'Inciting' means *causing activity*. Attachment and the rest incite, or cause the activity of, man towards virtuous or sinful deeds, and whenever there is ignorance, there are attachment and aversion †

Objection—"Everyone knows what these *Defects* are, why are they described by means of a definition?"

As a matter of fact, persons affected by attachment aversion and ignorance (which are the inciters to activity) are distinguished (or characterised) by their action the man who has attachments does that action whereby he experiences pleasure or pain, similarly the man who has aversion, or one who has ignorance [And it was necessary to bring out this fact of Attachment etc being the cause of activity, in order to produce disgust against them, which fact could not have been brought

ing and the like, have all got the Body for their object as it is the Body that is active similarly, sympathy, jealousy and the like are operations having the Mind for their object as it is the Mind that is active This explanation of the two expressions—'*Kayamuttā* and '*Manonamuttā*'—are necessitated by the fact that otherwise all operations could be called both *Kayamuttā* and *Manonamuttā* as there is not a single action of man in which both Mind and Body are not the cause

* The action of the *inciter* can be understood only after that of the *incited* has been understood hence after the definition of Activity comes the turn of its excitant, Defects—*Tatparjā*

† Both Attachment and Aversion arise from ignorance and urge the man to activity so that 'inciting' is a peculiarity of Attachment and Aversion, and this peculiarity subsists in the same substrate as the ignorance—*Tatparjā*

In explaining this, the *Parasuddhi* draws a distinction between *pratortaka* (that which incites) and *pravartara* (the action of inciting) What incites men to activity are ignorance and the consequent Attachment and Aversion towards the object on which the activity turns and the *inciting* is towards this activity, which is the means leading to that object, and with regard to which also there are ignorance and consequent Attachment and Aversion

out by the mere mention of Attachment and the other *Defects* for] when the words 'attachment,' 'aversion' and 'ignorance are used by themselves, not much is expressed by them *

Pretyabhava, Rebirth—The Ninth Prameya

Sūtra 19

† Rebirth consists in being born again

BHĀṢYA

Having died, when [the Soul] is born again in an animate body, this *being born again* constitutes the *Rebirth* of that [Soul] which is born — i e, becomes connected with the body, the sense-organs the mind, apprehension, and experience and *being born again* consists in repeated connection with the body etc, — the word 'repeated' denotes *recurrence* ‡ The literal meaning of the word '*Pretyabhava*' may be thus explained — When the Soul, subsisting in a particular animate body, abandons the body etc previously occupied, then it *dies* (*prati*), and when it takes possession of another body and sense-organs etc, it is *born* (*bhavati*), so that '*pretyabhāva*' is *birth* (*bhāva*) after *death* (*pretya*) The recurrence of this process of birth and death should be regarded as without beginning and ending only with Final Release.

Fruition Phala—The Tenth Prameya

Sūtra 20

† Fruition is a thing produced by activity and defect

* The *Tatparjya* explains—All that the words express are the mere forms of the defects and they give no idea of their being exponents of activity and until this fact is brought out there would be no disgust against the Defects as there is nothing wrong in Attachment or Aversion *per se* it is only when they give rise to activity bringing pleasure and pain that they come to be recognised as something to be shunned

† The *Tatparjya* omits to mention the ground for the treatment of Rebirth after Defect The *Parisuddhi* says—Rebirth is the acquisition of the Body etc down to Defects after the abandonment of the same, so that it is only natural that Rebirth should be dealt with after these

‡ Recurrence of connections with body etc implies also the abandoning of these — *Parisuddhi* :

† Fruition is the direct result of mere activity alone but the *Sūtra* adds *Defects* also with a view to show—(1) that defects are the cause of Activity and (2) that Pleasure and Pain (which constitute Fruition) are the

BHĀṢYA

Fruition consists in the experiencing of pleasure and pain, as every action leads to pleasure and pain. And as pleasure and pain appear only when the Body, the Sense organs, the Objects and Apprehension are present, what are meant to be included under the name 'Fruition' are pleasure and pain along with Body etc., which constitute the Fruition, which is a *thing produced by Activity and Defect*. Each time this Fruition is received by man, it is relinquished by him, and each time it is relinquished, it is again received and there is no end* or absolute cessation of these receivings and relinquishings, and it is by this unceasing current of receivings and relinquishings that the entire worldly process is carried on.

Pain, Duhkha—The Eleventh Prameya

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

This same (Fruition)—

Sutra 21

When connected with Annoyance is Pain

BHĀṢYA

By 'Annoyance†' here is meant *suffering, injury*. Every thing, (i.e. Body etc. and also Pleasure and Pain), being intermingled with it is invariably accompanied by, never existing apart from—pain, is inseparable from Pain, and as such is regarded as *Pain itself*. Finding everything to be intermingled with Pain,

result of Defects also. It is only when the soil of the Soul is irrigated with the water of Defect that the seeds of Merit and Demerit produce the fruits of Pleasure and Pain. —*Tatparya*

The *Parasuddhi* adds that the author of the Sutra will himself describe in Adh. IV how Defects help Activity in the bringing about of Fruition.

On the word '*Arthah*', thing, in the Sutra the *Tatparya* remarks—'The word is put in for including all kinds of Fruition, primary as well as secondary. The primary fruition consisting in Pleasure and Pain, and the secondary in the Body, the Sense organs and the rest—says the *Parasuddhi*.'

* *Niṣkha* is mere end, and as there is some sort of an end to Pleasure and Pain etc. at each Dissolution, the *Bhāṣya* corrects itself and adds the word '*Paryatrasanam*' absolute (para) sensation (*atrasana*). —*Tatparya*

† 'Annoyance' here stands for the feeling of annoyance, so that it refers primarily to Pain, but secondarily to the Body and the rest also—all of which are necessary factors in the feeling of pain. —*Tatparya*

when one wishes to get rid of pain, he finds that birth (or life) itself is nothing but pain, and thus becomes disgusted (with life), and being disgusted, he loses all attachment, and being free from attachment, he becomes released

Apavarga—Final Release—The Twelfth Prameya

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

When there is an and, an absolute cessation [of the series of receivings and relinquishings of Fruition], this is what constitutes Final Release, (which becomes thus defined) —

Sutra 22

**Absolute freedom from the aforesaid (Pain etc)
is Final Release**

BHĀṢYA

Release is absolute freedom from that—from the aforesaid Pain, i.e., from birth *

“How is this?”

When there is a relinquishing of the birth that has been taken and the non resumption of another,—this condition, which is without end (or limit) is known as ‘Final Release’, by those who know what Final Release is. This condition of immortality, free from fear,† imperishable (unchanging), consisting in the attainment of bliss, is called ‘Brahman’

Some people hold the view that—“in Final Release what is manifested is the eternal pleasure of the Soul, just like its vast

* The word *at* in the Sutra stands not only for Pain proper, but also for all such products as the Body, the Sense-organs etc., to everyone of which the name Pain is applied in its secondary sense —*Tatparya*

† The ‘fear’ meant here is the fear of being born into the world. The epithet ‘unchanging’ is added with a view to deny the view that Brahman evolves itself into diverse names and forms, the phrase ‘condition of immortality’ is meant to exclude the Bauddha theory that Release consists in the absolute cessation of the mind, resembling the extinguishing of the lamp.—*Tatparya* The *Parisuddhi* adds—Evolution is of two kinds—(1) the material object itself ceases and another object takes its place which idea of evolution is favoured by the *Bauddha*, and (2) the object remaining intact, there is a change in its qualities, this form of Evolution being held by the *Saṅkhya*. Neither of these two is possible in the case of Brahman, as in either case it would be transient

ness, and when that happiness is manifested, the Soul is absolutely free and becomes happy”*

This position is untenable, as there is no proof for what is here asserted, that is to say, there is neither Perception, nor Inference, nor Word of Scripture to prove that like its vastness, the eternal pleasure of the Soul is manifested in Final Release’

Then again, the above view of the *Vedāntin* meaning that (in Final Release) there is manifestation—i e feeling or experience—of the eternal (pleasure),—it behoves him to point out the cause of this ‘manifestation’ In other words when it is asserted that there is experienced a feeling or knowledge of eternal (pleasure), it is necessary to explain what is the cause of this manifestation—i e, the cause whereby it is produced

(a) If it be held that the manifestation, or experiencing or feeling of pleasure is eternal, like the pleasure itself [so that there can be no production of it by any cause, which, therefore, need not be pointed out],—then there would be no difference between the Soul released and the Soul still in the meshes of birth and rebirth That is to say just as the released Soul is endowed with the eternal pleasure and its eternal experience, so also would be the Soul that is still involved in birth and rebirth as both these Souls are eternal (and would therefore be equally endowed with the pleasure which also is eternal and as such cannot be absent at any time, even before Final Release] And if this be admitted, then people would be cognisant of the concomitance and simultaneity (of Final Release) with the result of Merit and Demerit In other words we would be cognisant of the concomitance and simultaneity of the eternal feeling of eternal pleasure with that pleasure and pain which, brought about by Merit and Demerit in the substrates (viz, the souls) wherein they are produced, are actually experienced by turns! And there would never be any substrate (soul) where either pleasure or its experience would be absent, both of these being *ex-hypothesi*, eternal!

* We have the text ‘*vyñānam anandam brahma*’ where all the three appear as synonymous, so that Brahman is of the nature of happiness, and as Brahman is eternal, the happiness also must be eternal Hence in the phrase ‘happiness of the Soul’, the preposition ‘of’ has the sense of apposition —*Tatparya*

(b) If, on the other hand, it be held that the feeling of pleasure is not eternal, then it becomes necessary to point out its cause, *i e*, if it be held that the manifestation in Final Release of the eternal pleasure is not eternal,—then it becomes necessary to point out the cause from which that manifestation proceeds.

As regards the Mind-Soul contact, it can be such a cause only when aided by other causes, *i e*, if it be held that the Mind-Soul contact is the cause of the said manifestation of pleasure then it would be necessary to point out some other cause which aids the said contact (in bringing about that manifestation of pleasure) *

If Merit be held to be that auxiliary cause, then the cause of this has to be pointed out, *i e*, if Merit be held to be that other accessory cause, then it becomes necessary to point out the cause from which that Merit proceeds [which, through the Mind Soul contact, brings about the manifestation of eternal pleasure] The merit that is produced by Yogic contemplation, being a product, must have an end so that if the product of this ephemeral Merit (in the shape of the said manifestation) were held to be eternal, this would involve an incongruity (the continuance of the product in the absence of the cause), consequently it is necessary to regard the said manifestation also as coming to an end on the cessation of the Merit. That is to say, if the Merit brought about by Yogic contemplation be the cause of the Merit that brings about the manifestation of pleasure, then, inasmuch as the continuance of the product after the cessation of the cause would involve an incongruity, it would be necessary to admit that, when the Merit ceases,—as it must cease, being itself a product—there must follow the entire cessation of the feeling of pleasure. And when the *feeling* of pleasure is absent, the *pleasure* itself is as good as non-existent. In other words, if there is a cessation of the *feeling* of pleasure, on account of the disappearance of Merit, then it cannot be true that *eternal* pleasure is felt, as there is nothing to determine whether the feeling is absent, because the pleasure itself is absent, or that the feeling is absent even though the pleasure is present

* Alone by itself, the Mind Soul contact can bring about nothing

[Nor will it be right, with a view to escape from these difficulties, to hold that the Merit is eternal, as] there is nothing to prove that the Merit is imperishable, for the simple reason that it is something that is produced. That is to say, there can be no arguments to prove that the Merit produced by Yogic contemplation does not perish, on the other hand there is a clear argument to the contrary—viz 'a thing that is produced is non eternal [and Merit being *produced*, must be ephemeral]' In case there were a person whose feeling of pleasure never ceased, he alone would be justified in arguing that the cause of that feeling (Merit) is eternal. But if Merit were eternal, there would be no difference between the man that has been *released* and one who is still in the meshes of birth and rebirth,—as we have already pointed out above. What we mean is that, just as in the case of the released man, the pleasure as well as the cause of the feeling of that pleasure are both eternal—and there is no cessation of the feeling itself for the simple reason that the Merit, which causes the feeling, is eternal,—so in the case of the worldly man also [as his Merit also would be eternal, its effects, in the shape of the feeling of pleasure, would also be eternal]. And this would mean that Final Release is co-existent with the feelings of pleasure and pain brought about by Merit and Demerit*. It might be argued that (in the case of the worldly man) the presence of the Body, and the Sense organs is the cause of obstruction (of pleasure-experience). But this cannot be right, as the Body etc. are for the very purpose of experience, and there is no reason to prove the contrary. In other words, our Opponent might put forward the explanation that in the case of the man who is still in the meshes of worldliness, the presence of the Body etc., obstructs the operation of the cause that leads to the feeling of eternal pleasure, so that there is a clear difference between the worldly man and the released man (in whose case, the Body etc., having fallen off, there is no obstruction). This however is not right, as the only purpose for which the Body the Sense-organs and the rest exist is to bring about experience, so that it is not possible that they should

* As it is such feelings that abound in worldly existence, and both worldly Existence and Release have been shown to be co-eternal

obstruct or hinder the experiencing (of eternal Pleasure), specially as there is nothing to prove that there is any sort of experience for the Soul deprived of the Body and the rest

The Author has said above that there is no proof in support of the view that final Release consists in pleasure. In order to meet this, the Vedantin puts forward proofs in support of his view] 'The activity of man is always for the purpose of obtaining what is desired'—If this be urged as a proof in support of the Vedānta view, then we deny this, as activity is (also) for the purpose of removing what is undesirable. That is to say, the Vedantin might put forward the following argument—* 'The instructions in regard to Final Release, as also the activity of men desiring Final Release are both for the purpose of obtaining what is desirable and neither of the two can be absolutely useless.' But this reasoning will not be right, as the instruction relating to Final Release as well as the activity of men desiring Final Release may both be also for the sake of avoiding or removing what is undesirable. That the said activity is for the purpose of removing something undesirable (and not always for obtaining what is desirable) is also proved by the fact that there is nothing that is absolutely desirable and not mixed up with an undesirable element so that what is desirable also becomes undesirable, and thus when one is active towards the removing of something undesirable he comes to remove or renounce also what is desirable, as removing by discrimination is not possible i.e., it is not possible to remove the one without also removing the other.

As regards the renouncing of what is desirable this applies with equal force to the case of the Body etc. That is to say, the Vedantin might put forth the following argument—We see as a matter of fact, that people renounce the ordinary transitory pleasure and seek for the more lasting pleasure (which proves the presence of a pleasure that is ever lasting and this is Final Release). But on the analogy of this argument you might also

* The real sense of this argument is thus explained by the *Tātparyya*—'The scriptures urge men to activity towards the obtaining of Final Release and in ordinary experience we find that it is only when a man desires something that he acts towards its accomplishment and as pleasure is the only thing desirable it follows that Final Release must consist in pleasure.'

argue that, because in ordinary life people are found to renounce their ephemeral Body, Sense-organs and the rest, this indicates the presence of an eternal set of Body etc., for the released man, and in this manner you will have really established the singularity or aloofness and self sufficiency of the released man † ‡ If it be urged that this would be against all Proof, that would apply with equal force to both parties. In other words, it might be urged that the eternality of Body etc., being contrary to all evidence, it would not be right to assume such body etc., for the released man. But this could be said with equal force with regard to Pleasure also that is, the eternality of Pleasure being contrary to all evidence it is not right to assume such pleasure for the released Soul.

Inasmuch as the absolute cessation of metempsychic pain could be spoken of as 'Pleasure,' there would be no incongruity (in the view that Pleasure consists in the cessation of Pain), even though there be scriptural texts describing Release as 'Pleasure.' That is to say, even though there be certain scripture texts to the effect that 'absolute pleasure belongs to the released man —yet such texts could very well be taken as using the word 'pleasure' in the sense of 'absolute cessation of Pain' in fact in common parlance, we often find the word 'pleasure' used to denote the cessation or absence of pain. [So that the view that Final Release consists in the cessation of pain is quite in keeping with the said texts.]

Further * until there is a renunciation of the desire for eternal pleasure there can be no attaining of Final Release, for the simple reason that all desire or attachment has been held to be a *bondage*. That is to say if it be held that in Final Release eternal pleasure is manifested, then in accordance with this view, when ever a man would put forth activity for the attaining of Final Release, he would *do so* only under the influence of a desire for the eternal pleasure, and being so influenced he could never attain the Final Release, nor would he deserve the attainment of

† In seeking to prove that the man becomes free, isolated you come to prove that it is eternally beset with the entire set Body, sense-organs and all the rest of it.

* The reading '*śya prahane*' gives no sense, the Pandit' edition as also all the manuscripts consulted, read '*śyaprahane*'

Final Release, as desire of all kinds has been held to be a bondage, and it is not possible that a man should be *released* while he is under *bondage* !

* On the other hand when a man is free from desire for pleasure, there is no longer any feeling of aversion or undesirability (with regard to any thing) In other words when the man's desire for eternal pleasure has disappeared the desire for eternal pleasure being not there to obstruct (his path towards Final Release) [and the activity towards Release thus emanating from one who has renounced desire],—whether the man does or does not really obtain eternal pleasure in either case there is no doubt as to his attaining Final Release †

LECTURE 4

The Preliminaries of Reasoning

DOUBT

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

§ *Doubt* having been the next in order to appear in the Mention of Categories (in Su 1), it is now—after the definition of its predecessor, 'Objects of Cognition'—time to put forward its definition This definition is now put forward—

* This is added in anticipation of the following objection — If Final Release consists of the removal of pain, then man's activity towards it could be due only to aversion to pain and aversion is as much a bondage as desire The sense of the reply is that there is real aversion only so long as there is no desire for something—the aversion being against that which obstructs the fulfilment of the desire

† Being free from all desire when the man betakes himself to activity towards the attaining of Release, he does not care whether the eternal pleasure comes to him or not As in any case the activity being of a man who is purified of all desire there can be no uncertainty as to his attaining Final Release — *Tatparya*

§ The *Purīṣuddhi* attempts a rational explanation of the order of sequence All knowledge depending on *Pramāṇas* and *Prameyas* being the objects sought to be known these two have been first mentioned Reasoning in all its details is what is to be explained next and among all these details Doubt comes first as until there is Doubt there is no occasion for any reasoning

Sūtra 23

Doubt is that wavering judgment in which the definite cognition of the specific character of any one object is wanting, and which arises either—(A) from the cognition of the characters common to the objects concerned, or (B) from the cognition of characters that serve to distinguish an object from diverse objects, or (C) from the presence of contradictory opinions,—and the appearing of such wavering judgments is due to the uncertainty attaching to perceptions and non-perceptions *

BHĀṢYA

(A) † *Doubt is the wavering judgment in which the definite cognition of the specific character of any one object is wanting, and which arises from the cognition of characters common to the objects concerned* For example, when a man perceives the qualities of length and breadth, which are common to man and post, and is desirous of detecting the previously perceived characters that would distinguish the one from the other, there arises in his mind the idea of 'whether it is this or that', and he cannot ascertain whether it is the one or the other, it is this uncertain cognition that constitutes *Doubt*,—and what raises the Doubt is the 'want', ‡ appearing in the form 'I can perceive only such characters as are common to the two things, and do not perceive the distinctive features of either', it is for this reason that Doubt is called 'that wavering judgment in which the definite cognition of the specific character of any one object is wanting'

§ (B) *Doubt arises from the cognition of characters that serve to distinguish an object from diverse objects* This is to be thus

* The interpretation of the *bu* by the *Bhāṣya* is different from that by the *Varṭika* and the *Tatparya*. According to the former the Sūtra puts forward five kinds of Doubt, according to the latter it lays down only three. The translation follows the latter interpretation.

† According to the *Bhāṣya*, there are five kinds of Doubt described in the Sūtra. The first kind of Doubt arises from the cognition of common characters.

‡ The *Tatparya* remarks that the mere presence of this want is not enough, what is meant by the word 'want' *Āpekṣa* is the remembrance of the distinctive characters of the things, along with the non-perception of those characters. This is supported by the last sentence of the *Bhāṣya* on Sū 23.

§ This is the second kind of Doubt.

explained. The word 'aneka', 'diverse', denotes all those things that are homogeneous and heterogeneous to the thing in question and Doubt arises from the cognition of characters that distinguish the thing from, or exclude * those 'diverse' objects, as a matter of fact, the specific character of a thing is found to serve both purposes,—things are distinguished by them from homogeneous as well as heterogeneous things, e.g. the presence of Odour distinguishes the Earth from Water and the rest (which being substances are homogeneous to Earth), as also from Qualities and Actions (which being not substances are heterogeneous to Earth) [As an example of Doubt arising from the cognition of the specific character of a thing, we have the following]—Sound is found to be endowed with a specific property in the form of being produced by disjunction, and the cognition of this character gives rise to the Doubt as to whether Sound is a Substance, a Quality or an Action. Inasmuch as the specific characters of things are found to serve both purposes (of distinguishing from homogeneous as well as heterogeneous things), there naturally arises a Doubt as to whether—(a) being an entity, Sound is a substance distinguished by the said specific character from Qualities and Actions, or (b) being an entity, it is a Quality distinguished by that character, or (c) being an entity, it is an Action distinguished by that character. † And in this case 'the want of cognition of the specific property' is in the form of the idea, 'I do not perceive any such character as

* The phrase '*tasya anekasya dharmah*' is explained by the *Vartika* and the *Tatparjya* in two ways —(1) *anekam tasmāt tīśefako dharmah*, the words *tasmāt tīśefako* being supplied (2) *tasya anekasya dharmah tyaavar takatayā*. Both interpretations have been combined in the translation.

† This explanation has been added with a view to the objection that it is only the remembrance of common properties that gives rise to Doubt and not that of specific or exclusive properties. The sense of the explanation is that (1) in the case of the Earth we know that it is an entity, and on perceiving that it has Odour we naturally are uncertain as to its being either a Substance or a Quality or an Action, all of which are entities, like the Earth, and the presence of Odour distinguishes it equally from all the three. (2) Similarly in the case of Sound it is an entity like Substance, Quality and Action so when we find that the presence of the character of being produced by disjunction distinguishes it equally from all entities—just as much from other Qualities as from Substances and Actions—there arises the Doubt as to its being a Substance, a Quality or an Action.

would definitely indicate any one of the three (Substance, Quality and Action) '.

*(C) Doubt arises from the presence of contradictory opinions, Contradictory notions entertained with regard to one and the same thing constitute 'contradictory opinions', 'contradiction' consisting in the mutual enmity, i.e. incompatibility. For instance, one system of philosophy asserts that 'the Soul exists', while another declares that 'there is no such thing as Soul', and when no proof one way or the other is available, there is an uncertainty as to the truth; and this constitutes *Doubt*.

†(D) Doubt also arises from uncertainty attaching to perceptions. As a matter of fact, there is perception of really existing water, as in the tank and such other reservoirs, there is perception also of non-existent water in the rays of the Sun (appearing in the mirage), so that when in any particular case there is perception of water, and yet there is no proof available which would determine the real character of what is perceived, there arises a Doubt as to whether the water perceived is really existent or non-existent.

‡(E) Doubt also arises from uncertainty attaching to non-perceptions. As a matter of fact we find that even really existing things are not perceived, e.g. we do not perceive the water within the roots and branches of trees, and there is non-perception also of what is non-existent, e.g. of what is not produced at all, or what has been destroyed, so that whenever there is non-perception of a

This is the *Bhāṣya's* answer. The answer of the *Varṭika* is thus explained by the *Tatparya*—It is true that the character of being produced by disjunction has never been found in Substances, &c., but the absence of that character is found equally in all—in Substances, in Qualities, in Actions, so that when Sound is found to possess this character as also the character of being an entity,—the latter being common to Substances, Qualities, and Actions—there arises the Doubt—'Being distinguished from Substances and Actions by the character of being produced by disjunction, is Sound a Quality? Or being distinguished from Qualities and Actions, is it a Substance? Or being distinguished from Qualities and Substances, is it an Action?' Thus in this case the specific character brings to the mind the other things only by negation, i.e., by reason of its absence being common to all.

* This is the third kind of Doubt.

† This is the fourth kind of Doubt, according to the *Bhāṣya*.

‡ This is the fifth kind of Doubt, according to the *Bhāṣya*.

thing there arises the Doubt as to whether what is not perceived really exists, or it does not exist at all. In this case also 'the want of cognition of the specific character' is as before.

* In the first two kinds of Doubt, the 'common properties' and the 'properties distinguishing an object from diverse objects' are such as subsist in the object cognised, while in the fourth kind, the 'perception' and 'non perception' subsist in the cognising person, and it is only by reason of this difference or peculiarity that these have been mentioned separately.

The definition common to all forms of Doubt comes to be this.—'Doubt is a wavering judgment which arises from the apprehension of things possessed of common properties, proceeding from the cognition of common properties and depending upon the remembrance of specific properties.

Prayojana Motive

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

As before, the definition proceeds in accordance with the order in which the several categories have been mentioned in the opening Sūtra.

Sūtra 24

That object, aiming at which one acts is called 'Motive'
BHĀṢYA

An object is capable of being either acquired or rejected and when a person determines or fixes upon an object as to be either acquired or got rid of, he has recourse to the means of acquiring or getting rid of it, and that object is called the 'motive', simply because it forms the cause of that activity of the agent. An object is said to be 'aimed at' when there is a determination on the part of the agent with regard to it in the form, either

* The Bhāṣya regards the uncertainty attaching to Perception and the uncertainty attaching to non perception as distinct and independent causes of Doubt and so proceeds to show here that the Doubts aroused by these uncertainties cannot be included in those aroused by the cognition of common character' or of characters distinguishing the object from diverse objects'. This view is controverted by the *Ī ārtika* (Page 99 Line 21 cf. *seg Bib Ind Ed*)—*Tātparya*

The *Ī ārtika* takes the first *samānādharma* as a Bahuvrīhi compound

Sūtra 26

Doctrine is a theory or conviction in regard to the exact nature of a thing dealt with by Philosophy *

INTRODUCTION BHĀṢYA

By *tantrasamsthitiḥ* in the Sūtra 27 is meant the conviction resting upon the direct assertions of philosophy, the word 'tantra', opinion can be held as to its exact nature the word 'anta' means end, by which, in the present context, is meant that final and well-determined conviction which people have with regard to the exact nature of any particular thing

In regard to these lines of the *Bhāṣya*, the *Tatparya* has remarked that 'the author of the *Bhāṣya* without mentioning the Sūtra containing the general definition of *Siddhanta* has given an explanation of its import' This has been taken by some writers to mean that there was some other Sūtra now lost to us which contained the said general definition. As a matter of fact however, Sūtra 26 itself supplies—especially according to the explanation of the *Vartika* and the *Tatparya*—the general definition of *Siddhanta*, so that all that the *Tatparya* means is that the explanation of the general definition by the *Bhāṣya*, instead of following the Sūtra precedes it

* The *Vartika* has taken the two Sūtras 26 and 27 together so the *Vartika* appears after Sū 27. The translation of the Sūtra is in accordance with the interpretation of the *Vartika* and *Tatparya*; which explain the compound '*tantradhikarānabhyupagomāsamsthitiḥ*' by taking '*tantradhikarāna*' as a *Bohutvīhi* compound—'*tantram adhikaranam jetaṁ*', and this, with the rest of the word as a genitive *Tatpurya*. The exact position of the *Bhāṣya* appears to be doubtful. If we take the *Bhāṣya* appearing after Sū 26 as explanatory of Sūtra 26, then it is clear that it takes '*tantradhikarānabhyupagoma*' as a *Drandra*, and thereby connects each of these severally with the word '*samsthitiḥ*'. According to the *Bhāṣya* then the translation of the Sūtra 26 would run thus—*Doctrine is conviction resting upon philosophy on implication and on hypothesis*. We have given preference to the *Vartika* interpretation, because by the *Bhāṣya* the Sūtra is made to contain an enumeration of the different kinds of *Siddhanta* while by the *Vartika* interpretation this Sūtra supplies a general definition, and the several kinds are enumerated in the next Sūtra 27. It is this interpretation by the *Bhāṣya* which affords occasion to the objector in the *Vartika* to put the question as to the Sūtra being a general definition or an enumeration. According to the *Tatparya* however, the *Bhāṣya* appearing after Sū 26 is explanatory not of Sūtra 26, but of Sūtra 27. Just as the sense of Sūtra 26 which contains the general definition of *Doctrine*, is given by the *Bhāṣya* before the Sūtra so of Sūtra 27 also the sense is explained before the Sūtra. As this interpretation reconciles the *Bhāṣya* with the *Vartika* we adopt it; and therefore take the said lines of the *Bhāṣya* as explanatory of Sūtra 27.

'philosophy', standing for the teachings in connection with things connected with one another ; [this includes the first two kinds of theory mentioned in *Sūtra* 27]—'*adhikarāṇasamsthitiḥ*' is the conviction resting on implication, and not on direct assertion,—and '*ābhyaṃgamasamsthitiḥ*' is the hypothetical and tentative acceptance of an opinion not duly ascertained, [and not directly stated in philosophy]—such acceptance being for the purpose of examining the detailed particulars of the theory

Doctrine thus is of four kinds, on account of diversity among the several philosophies,—as described in this *Sūtra*. And each of these four kinds is quite distinct

Sūtra 27

Doctrine is of four distinct kinds —(1) Doctrine common to all philosophies, (2) Doctrine peculiar to one philosophy, (3) Doctrine resting on implication, and (4) Hypothetical Doctrine

BHĀṢYA

These are the four kinds of Doctrine, and among these—

Sūtra 28

(1) The 'Doctrine Common to all Philosophies' is that philosophical conviction, or theory, which is not incompatible with any philosophy

As for example, such opinions as 'the olfactory organ and the rest are Sense-organs', 'odour and the rest are the objects apprehended by means of these Sense organs', 'the Earth and the rest are material substances', 'things are cognised by means of the Instruments of Cognition'

Sūtra 29

(2) That which is accepted by only one Philosophy, and is not accepted by any other Philosophy, is called the Doctrine peculiar to one philosophy

BHĀṢYA

For example, the following doctrines are peculiar to the *Sāṃkhya*s :—'An absolute non-entity can never come into existence', 'an entity can never absolutely lose its existence', 'intelligences are unmodifiable', 'modification belongs to the three gross

products, Body, Sense organ and Mind, and also to the subtle causes of these (in the shape of *Buddhi Ahankāra* and the five Rudimentary Substances); and also the following which are peculiar to the Yōga * philosophers,—‘The entire elemental creation is due to the influence of the past deeds of men’, ‘the defects of men and also their activity are the cause of Karman’, ‘intelligent beings are endowed with their own respective qualities’, ‘that thing alone is produced which had no existence before’, ‘that which is produced is destroyed’

Sūtra 30

(3) That is called Doctrine resting on Implication[†] on the knowledge or acceptance of which depends the knowledge or acceptance of another fact †

BHĀṢYA

When it so happens that a certain fact having become established or known, other facts become implied,—and without these latter facts the former fact itself cannot be established,—the former, constituting the basis of these latter, is called ‘*Doctrine resting on Implication*’ or ‘*Implied Doctrine*,’ e.g. when the fact that the cogniser is distinct from the body and the sense-organs is proved or indicated by the fact of one and the same object being apprehended by the organs of vision and touch,—the facts implied are —(1) that there are more sense organs than one, (2) that the sense organs operate upon particular kinds of objects, (3) that they have their existence indicated by the apprehension of their objects, (4) that they are the instruments bringing about the cognitions of the cogniser, (5) that the substratum of qualities

* Some people take this to mean ‘Vaiśeṣika philosophy’ on the ground that what is ordinarily known as the Yōga * philosophy does not hold the view that ‘*asat upadyate*’

† In connection with this Sūtra the *Pārsuuddhi* adds an interesting note—“Bhāṣana and others have provided two explanations of this Sū (1) When an object endowed with the quality of omniscience is known, then alone is known the fact of Earth and the rest having a creator, so the former is an Implied Doctrine, and (2) the knowledge of the fact of Earth &c. having a creator includes that of the fact that there is an omniscient being—the latter being implied by the former, and here the former is an Implied Doctrine. The Bhāṣya and its followers have not given this twofold explanation, as there is not much real difference between the two

is a substance other than the qualities of odour and the rest and (6) that intelligent beings cognise only particular objects. All these facts are included in the aforesaid fact (of the cogniser being distinct from the body &c &c) as this fact would not be possible without all those other facts.

Sūtra 31

(4) When a fact is taken for granted without investigation,* and thence proceeds the Examination of its particular details we have a case of Hypothetical Doctrine.

BHĀṢYA

When a fact is taken for granted without investigation this constitutes what is called Hypothetical Doctrine e.g. it is taken for granted without investigation that Sound is a substance, and thence proceeds an investigation as to whether Sound is eternal or non eternal—in which investigation are examined such details of Sound as its eternality or non eternality. An author has recourse to this kind of Doctrine with a view to show off the cleverness of his own intellect and through utter disregard for the intellect of others.

LECTURE VI

Reasoning

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

We next proceed to describe the Factors of Inference.

Sūtra 32

(1) Statement of the Proposition (2) Statement of the Probans (3) Statement of the Corroborative Instance, (4) Reaffirmation and (5) Final Conclusion—These are the Factors of Reasoning.

* Some logicians declare that there are ten Factors viz—(1) Desire to know, (2) Doubt, (3) Capacity to accomplish what is desired (4) Purpose and (5) Dispelling of the Doubt (in addition to

* The Vārtika explains 'aparīkṣita' as not mentioned in the Sūtras but it appears simpler to take it as meaning not investigated. The *Tatparya* construes the Sūtra thus—*anūśītabhyupagamād hetoh yatah tadvisēṣa-parīkṣanam kṛīyate tasmāt tatparyaparīkṣanam jñāyate anūśītamāpi abhyupagatam sūtrakareṇa*.

the five mentioned in the *Sūtra*),—why should not these additional five have been mentioned? " *

To the above question the *Bhāṣya* makes the following answer —(1) As for *Desire to Know*, it is only that which urges, or brings forward, the purpose meant to be accomplished by the cognition of a thing not already cognised. Why does a person desire to know what is cognised? He does so simply with the view that when he comes to know it in its true character, he will either abandon it, or acquire it, or treat it with indifference, so that the ideas of abandoning or acquiring or treating with indifference are the purpose served by the true knowledge of the thing and it is for the sake of this purpose that the man desires to know the thing,—and certainly this desire does not prove anything [and as such can not be regarded as a factor of reasoning, which is meant to prove the conclusion] (2) As for *Doubt*, which forms the basis of the desire to know, it apprehends mutually contradictory properties, and as such it can be regarded as only proximate to true cognition, as of two contradictory properties only one can be true, † So that even though Doubt has been dealt with separately, as a category by itself [it will not be right to regard it as a Factor

* The Jaina logician, Bhadrabāhu (B. C. 433—354), who wrote the *Darśanīkāṅkīrṇī* lays down ten Factors though another Jaina logician Siddhasena Divakara (A. D. 1-85) mentions only five. The ten factors of Bhadrabāhu are —(1) *Pratijñā* Statement of the Proposition (2) *Pratijñā vādhāt* Limitation of the *Pratijñā*, (3) *Heṭu* Statement of the Reason (4) *Heṭuśiṅghāt* Limitation of the *Heṭu* (5) *Vipakṣa* Counter proposition (6) *Vipakṣapratijedha* Denial of the Counter proposition (7) *Dṛṣṭānta* Example, (8) *Ākāṅkṣā*, Doubting the Validity of the Example, (9) *Ākāṅkṣā pratijedha*, Dispelling of the Doubt, (10) *Nigamana* Final Conclusion. The *Samāyogya* of the *Bhāṣya* stands for the '*Ākāṅkṣāpratijedha*', and '*Samāyoga*' for the '*Ākāṅkṣā*', of Bhadrabāhu. But here the parallel ceases. It would seem therefore that the *Bhāṣya* had in view a writer other than Bhadrabāhu.

† The Puri manuscript reads *vyāśedhānarmopasāṅghādātattva*. Though the grammatical construction of this reading becomes difficult the sense becomes clearer. With this reading the translation should run as follows—'Doubt is nearer to Wrong Cognition, i. e., to that form of Wrong Cognition which apprehends two contradictory properties at the same time for the simple reason that of the two contradictory properties only one can be true, so that not being of the nature of true Cognition Doubt cannot prove anything.'

of Reasoning, [as] it cannot prove anything (not being of the nature of true cognition) (3) As regards *Capacity to accomplish what is desired*,—as for instance the Instruments of Right Cognition have the capacity of accomplishing, for the cognising agent, the apprehension of the objects of cognition,—this could not form part of an argument put forward for proving a proposition, in the manner in which the statement of the Proposition forms part of it, (4) As for *Purpose*,—which consists in the ascertaining of the real nature of the thing sought to be known—this is the *result*, and not a *factor*, of the argument put forward to prove a proposition (5) Lastly, as for the *Dispelling of Doubt*,—which consists in the setting forth of the counter proposition and then denying it,—this only tends to lend support to some other Instrument of Right Cognition, and it cannot be regarded as a part of the argument put forward to prove a proposition [Though *Desire to Know* and the rest cannot be regarded as Factors of Reasoning] yet *Desire to Know* and the rest have their use in Discussions, specially as they help the thing concerned to become known As for the *Statement of Proposition* and the rest, on the other hand, inasmuch as these tend to bring about the true cognition of the thing, they are regarded as *parts* or *factors*, of the argument that is put forward to prove a proposition †

From among those (Factors) as divided above—

Sūtra 33

The 'Statement of the Proposition' consists in the assertion of what is to be proved—the Probandum

'That is the 'Statement of the Proposition' is that assertion which speaks of the Subject which is intended to be qualified by that property which has to be made known or proved (by the reasoning),—this is what is meant by the words of

† The *Parasuddhi* notes that the difference between the two lies in this that while *Desire to Know* and the rest help the Discussion by their mere presence, the *Statement of the Proposition* and the rest help by their cognition. If the Desire to know is present the Discussion proceeds, it is not necessary to know or apprehend the *Desiré*. But the Statement of the Proposition the Statement of the Probandum and the rest should be themselves known, before they can lead to the final cognition of things

the *Sūtra* that 'Pratijñā consists in the mention of the Probandum'. [As an example of this, we have the statement] 'Sound is non eternal'

Sūtra 34

The 'Statement of the Probans' is that which Demonstrates the Probandum, through its similarity (i.e. a property common to it and) to the Corroborative Instance

BHĀṢYA

That which 'demonstrates'—i.e. makes known, or proves—the 'Probandum'—i.e., the property to be proved (as belonging to the Subject),—through a property common to the Corroborative Instance,—is the 'Statement of the Probans' That is to say, when one notices a certain property in the Subject (with regard to which the conclusion is to be demonstrated)* and notices the same property also in the Corroborative Instance, and then puts forward that property as demonstrating (or proving) the Probandum,—this putting forward of the said property constitutes the 'Statement of the Probans' As an example (in connection with the proposition 'Sound is not eternal') we have the Statement 'because sound has the character of being a product, as a matter of fact everything that is a product is not eternal'

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

"Does the aforesaid definition (stated in Su. 34) constitute the entire definition of 'Statement of the Probans'?" No
"What then?"

Sūtra 35

And also through dissimilarity

BHĀṢYA

That is to say, the 'Statement of the Probans' is that also which demonstrates the Probandum through dissimilarity to the Corroborative Instance (i.e., through a property that belongs to the Instance and not to the Probandum) "How?" For example,—'Sound is non-eternal, because it has the character of being produced,—that

* The term *Sādhya* is used in the present context rather profusely. It stands for the probandum, the character to be demonstrated, the predicate of the conclusion—as also for the Subject the thing in regard to which that character is to be demonstrated.

which has *not* the character of being produced is always eternal, e.g., such substances as the Soul and the like”*

Sūtra 36

That Familiar instance,—which through similarity to what is to be proved (i.e. the Subject) is possessed of a property of that (Subject)—constitutes the ‘Statement of the Corroborative Instance

BHĀṢYA

† ‘Similarity to what is proved’ consists in the presence of the same property in both, when by reason of this similarity the

* The reading of the Vizia Edit on is defective the proper reading is ‘*anityah sabdah utpatti dharmakatti at anutpattidharm kam vityam yatha atmadidratyam*’ as found in the Puri MSS

† The wording of this Sūtra is not clear. The meaning is clear enough—that is the right example which possesses two properties in common with the Subject—one property whose presence in the Subject is to be proved and the other that which is already known to subsist in it. But the difficulty arises from the presence of the word *sadhyā* in the Sūtra. Ordinarily this word stands for the Probandum, that whose presence in the Subject is to be proved, that the word cannot mean this in the present Sūtra is made clear in the *Vartika*. The translation has adopted the explanation provided by the *Tatparjā* as follows—*Sadhyasadharmjā* must mean the similarity of the Instance to the Subject—this similarity in the case of the reasoning ‘Sound is non-external because it is a product’ consisting in the presence of the property of *being produced* which is the Probans this is equally present in the Subject Sound which is to be proved as non-external, and in the Instance dish &c. and on the basis of this similarity the Instance is found to possess another property meant to belong to that same Subject (Sound)—that is that the connection of Sound with which is to be proved e.g. the property of non-externality and the dish &c. are actually found to be possessed of this last property.

There is yet another difficulty—*udāharana* as a factor of reasoning is a *verbal statement* how can a familiar instance which is an object possessing certain properties be called a statement? This difficulty has been sought to be cleared by the *Vartika*.

The translation has adopted the interpretation of the *Vartika* and the *Bhāṣya*. But the Sūtra is capable of a much simpler interpretation—*Sadhyena (dharmena anityatena) sadharanāt (samanadāharaṇjāt sadhyasamanadāharaṇam dharmantaramutpattidharmakati amavalambya) tad dharmabhuvi (sadhyadharmatan)*—translated thus—‘That familiar instance which possessing a property that is known to be co-existent or concomitant with

familiar instance is found to be *possessed of a character of that same*,—i e, the character of what is to be proved 'What is to be proved' is of two kinds—(a) in some cases it is the property as qualified by (belonging to) the object,—as when we assert the 'non eternality of Sound', and (2) in others it is the object as qualified by the property, as when we assert that 'sound is non eternal', and it is this latter that is referred to by the pronoun *tat* [in the compound *taddharmabhāvi*] (in the *Sūtra*) [and not the *probandum*, which is what is usually spoken of as '*sādhya*'] "How do you know that it is this latter that is meant by the word '*sādhya*' here?" For the simple reason that we find the 'property', '*dharma*', mentioned separately from '*that*', '*tat*' [so that '*tat*' and '*dharma*' could not be the same], the word '*taddharmabhāvi*' means 'that which has the *bhāva* or presence of the *dharma* or property of '*tat*' or '*that*', that is to say, that familiar instance which is possessed of a property that belongs also to the Subject, and it is such an instance which can be spoken of as 'possessed of a property of the Subject', in virtue of its similarity to that Subject. For instance, in the reasoning 'sound is non eternal, because it has the character of being produced', what the *probans*, 'being produced', means is that *being produced, it ceases to be*,—i e *loses itself*,—i e *is destroyed*. here we find that *being produced* is meant to be the *means of proving* (i e the *Probans*) and *being non-eternal* is what is *proved* (the *Probandum*), and the notion that there is the relation of *means and object* between the two properties can arise only when the two are found to co-exist in any one thing, and it arises only by reason of the 'similarity' (of a number of things, in every one of which the two properties are found to co-exist), so that when one has per

the *probandum* possesses also the *probandum*. The *Bhāṣya* the *Vārtika* and the *Taṭparya* appear to have been led away by the impossibility of there being any '*Sādharma*' (similarity) between the Instance (which is an object a *dharma*) and the *Probandum* (which is a property, a *dharma*). But the *Bhāṣya* itself affords an explanation (below) which shows that '*Sādharma*' means concomitance in a single substratum, and not similarity, and that this concomitance is between the two properties—i e non eternality (*probandum*) and 'being produced', both of which known to be concomitant, should subsist in the Instance.

ceived the said relation in the familiar instance, he naturally infers the same in Sound also,—the form of the inference being 'Sound also is non eternal, because it has the character of being produced, just like such things as the dish the cup and like' And this is called 'Statement of the Corroborative Instance', '*udaharana*' because it is what is the means of establishing between the two properties, of the relation of means and object

Sūtra 37

And the other kind of 'statement of Corroborative Instance' is that which is contrary to what has been described in the foregoing Sūtra

BHĀṢYA

What is meant to be described is that familiar instance which constitutes the Statement of Corroborative Instance so that what the Sūtra means is that the other kind of Statement of the (heterogeneous) Instance consists in *that familiar instance which, through dissimilarity to what is to be proved, is not possessed of a property of that Subject* E g Sound is non eternal, because it has the character of being produced, *everything not having the character of being produced is eternal for instance the Soul and the rest*—here 'Soul and the rest' constitute the required familiar instance which through their 'dissimilarity to what is to be proved—i e on account of their not having the character of being produced—are not possessed of the property of the Subject,'—i e the property of *non-eternality* When we find that in the case of the Soul the character of *being produced* being absent* it does not possess non eternality, we infer the contrary in the case of Sound,—'because Sound is possessed of the character of *being produced*, Sound is non-eternal' †

* The reading *ya—bhatat* is wrong the correct reading given in the Puri Ms is *syabhatat*

† The *Tatparya* takes except on to the example cited in the *Bhāṣya*—Both the examples cited in the *Bhāṣya*—that of the Homogeneous Instance as well as that of the Heterogeneous Instance—are those of the affirmative-negative kind and in the latter case it has declared that the absence of the property to be proved is due to the absence of the character which proves it and this is not right as in the case of the 'affirmative-negative' reasoning even though a heterogeneous Instance be available the right course is always to c to the homogeneous Instance, as the *dissimilarity* of a

When the Probans is stated with a view to similarity—i.e. in the affirmative form—what constitutes the *Statement of the Instance* is that familiar instance which, through its similarity to what is to be proved, is possessed of a property of the Subject, and when the Probans is stated with a view to dissimilarity,—i.e. in the negative form—the *Statement of the Instance* consists of that familiar instance which, through its dissimilarity to what is to be proved does not possess the property of the Subject. In the former case, the observer perceives in the Instance, that it possesses two properties so related that the presence of the one proves the presence of the other, and from this he comes to infer that in the case of the Subject also the presence of the one should prove the presence of the other,—and in the latter case he observes in regard to the Instance that there are two properties so related that the absence of one proves the absence of another, and from this he comes to infer that in the case of the Subject also the said properties are similarly related, the absence of one proving the absence of the other.

The process (of corroboration by means of familiar instances) is not possible in the case of fallacious Probans, and it is for this reason that they are regarded as fallacious, as not true probans.

The subject of this related capacity of the Probans and the Instance is very subtle and difficult to grasp, it can be rightly understood only by exceptionally wise and learned men.

thing is recognised always after its similarity—so that it is not right to have recourse to the roundabout way when a straight road is available for the same purpose. This contention appears to be favoured by the *Īdrīka* also which says that an instance of the heterogeneous Instance is to be found cited in connection with the 'Negative' reasoning. The instance that the *Tātparyā* would have is found in the following reasoning—The living body is with soul because otherwise it would be without the life breath,—like the *jar* where the 'property of the Subject—the living body—having the life breath—is not present in the *jar*. What the *Bhāṭya* itself proceeds to explain in the next sentence shows that the instance cited cannot be the right one, if it is true that when the Probans is stated affirmatively the Instance cited should be homogeneous then in the case of the reasoning 'Sound is non-eternal because it has the character of being produced'—where the probans is stated affirmatively—the right example could not be the heterogeneous one while if the reasoning is put forward in the form 'the living body is with soul, as otherwise it would be without the life breath'—where the probans is stated negatively—then the heterogeneous Instance of the *jar* as cited by the *Tātparyā*.

Sūtra 38

The 'Re affirmation' is that which, on the strength of the Instance, re-asserts the Subject as being 'so' [*i.e.*, as possessing the character which has been found, in the Instance, to be concomitant with the Probandum]—or as being 'not so' [*i.e.*, as not possessing the character which has been found in the Instance to be concomitant with the negation of the Probandum]

BHĀṢYA

The term '*udāharaṇasāpekṣaḥ*' means 'depending on the Instance'—*i.e.* on the strength of the Instance

(a) When the Instance cited is the homogeneous one, which is similar to the Subject,—*e.g.* when the Dish is cited as the example to show, that it is a *product* and is *non eternal*—we have the 'Re affirmation' stated in the form, '*Sound is so*'—*i.e.* '*Sound is a product*', where the character of *being a product* is affirmed of the Subject *Sound* (b) When the Instance cited is the heterogeneous one, which is dissimilar to the Subject,—*e.g.* when the Soul is cited as an example of the substance which, *not being a product*, is *eternal*,—the 'Re-affirmation' is stated in the form '*Sound is not so*'; where the character of *being a product* is reasserted of the Subject, *Sound*, through the denial of the affirmation of the character of *not being produced*. Thus there are two kinds of *Reaffirmation*, based upon the two kinds of *Instance*

The term '*upasamhāra*' (in order to be made applicable to the *Verbal* re-affirmation) should be explained as *that by means of which there is reassertion (apasamkrīyate anena)* *

* On this Sūtra, the *Porasuddhi* remarks as follows.—When the Sūtra speaks of the two kinds of Re-affirmation, it refers to the definitions that it has given of the two kinds of Instance in the two preceding Sūtras. The two kinds of Instance have been defined separately; but the corresponding two kinds of *Re-affirmation* are defined in one Sūtra. The *Tatparya* observes that the definition common to both kinds of Re-affirmations would be in the form—उदाहरणपेक्षः उपसंहारः (साधकस्य) उपनयः—*i.e.*, Re-affirmation consists in the re-assertion of the Subject (as possessing the Probans), on the strength of the Instance.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Even though the Statement of the Probans and Re-affirmation are both of two kinds, yet of one uniform character is—

Sūtra 39

the Final Conclusion which is the re-statement of the Proposition on the basis of the Statement of the Probans *

The Probans having been stated either *per* similarity or *per* dissimilarity, we have a recapitulation (of the entire reasoning) in accordance with the Instance, and this recapitulation constitutes the Final Conclusion, which is in the form—'Therefore, having the character of product, Sound is non eternal' This has been called '*Nigamana*' (Final Conclusion), because it serves to connect or string together (*nigamyante* 'anena') the Proposition the Statement of the Probans, the Statement of the Example and the Re-affirmation, the word '*nigamyante*' being synonymous with the '*samarhiyante*', (are 'supported') and '*sambadhyante*' (are connected')

When the Probans has been stated *per* similarity, the Proposition is in the form of the Statement 'Sound is non eternal',—the Probans is stated in the form 'because it has the character of being a product',—the Instance is in the form 'things like the dish, which have the character of being a product, are all non eternal', the Re-affirmation is in the form 'Sound also has the same character of being a product',—and the Final Conclusion is in the form 'therefore, having the character of being a product Sound is non eternal' Similarly, when the Probans is stated *per* dissimilarity, the Proposition is in the form 'Sound is non eternal',—'because it has the character of being a product (Probans)',—'such things as the Soul which are not products are eternal' (Instance),—'Sound is not a thing that is not a product (Re-affirmation)',—'therefore not being a non product, Sound is non eternal' (Final Conclusion)

* As a matter of fact the Final Conclusion is what is established or proved while the Proposition asserts what is yet to be proved, but the two refer to the same thing that which appears in the conclusion as proved is precisely what has appeared before in the Proposition as to be proved. So that there is no incongruity in speaking of the Conclusion as being the Proposition

In every inferential statement, which consists of the (five 'Factors,') several distinct *pramāṇas* commingle and co operate towards the accomplishment of the end (in the shape of inferential cognition) There is 'commingling' in the following cases—(a) In the inference bearing on Sound, the *Proposition* ('Sound is non eternal') comes under verbal cognition, and verbal assertion, unless it is heard directly from a *Rsi*,—cannot by itself be accepted as 'trustworthy', and it stands in need of corroboration by Perception and Inference, (b) in the *Statement of the Probans* we have an 'Inference', being deduced, as it is, from the cognition of similarity by the Statement of the Instance,* this has been explained clearly in the *Bhāṣya* dealing with the *Statement of the Instance*,—(c) the *Statement of the Instance* represents Perception', the deduction of the unseen (unknown or uncertain conclusion) from the seen (what is perceived in the Instance) being only natural,—(d) the *Re-affirmation* is in the form of 'Analogy', as it is expressed in the form 'as that so this', or 'this is not as that is', when there is denial of the analogous character, in which case the *Re-affirmation* is in the form of the denial of the contrary character, —(e) the *Final Conclusion* serves to show how all the Factors combined are capable of bringing about the cognition of a single object (in the shape of the *Probandum* through that of the *Probans*)

There is mutual co operation also among the five Factors', e.g. (a) If there were no *Proposition* there would be no basis on which the *Statement of the Probans* and the other Factors could proceed, (b) if there were no *Statement of the Probans*, the instrumental efficiency of what (towards the bringing about of the cognition) could be shown (by the Inference)?—what again would that be whose connection with the Instance and the Probandum could be shown?—on the basis of what again could there be the *Final Conclusion* consisting in the re statement of the Proposition?—(c) If there were no *Statement of the Instance*, what would that be to which there would be similarity, or dissimilarity, of what is put forward as the means (*Probans*) of proving the Pro-

* The Probans is recognised as such only when the reasoner has become cognisant of the invariable concomitance between the Probandum and the Probans as perceived in the thing that is cited as the Instance

bandum²—on the strength of similarity to what too would the final recapitulation proceed?—(d) If there were no *Reaffirmation* the character put forward as proving the Probandum, not having its presence in the Probandum reasserted could not accomplish its purpose —(e) lastly, in the absence of the *Final Conclusion*, there would be nothing to indicate the mutual relationship among the Proposition and the other Factors, or the fact of their combining to accomplish a common purpose, and what too would it be that would be declared as proved by means of such expressions as 'so is this'?

We now proceed to show the purpose served by each of the five 'Factors of Reasoning' * (a) The *Proposition* serves the purpose of mentioning the relation between the character to be proved and the *Subject*, (b) the *Statement of the Probans* serves the purpose of stating the fact of a certain character, which is either similar or dissimilar to what is stated in the *Instance*, proving what is to be proved, (c) the *Statement of the Instance* serves the purpose of indicating the presence, between the two characters, of the relation of 'proof and proved' (Probans and Probandum), as manifested in a single substratum, (d) the purpose served by the *Reaffirmation* is to indicate the co-existence (in the *Subject*) of the character put forward as Probans with that put forward as the Probandum, —(e) and the *Final Conclusion* serves the purpose of showing that it is not possible to deny, in regard to the particular Probandum (and *Subject*) the relation of 'proof and proved' which has been found in the *Instance*, to subsist between the two characters †

* Though the purpose of each Factor has already been shown under the *śūtra* defining each of them yet the Author proceeds to explain it again for the good of his disciples.—*Tātparyā*

† The *Final Conclusion* thus is not the same as the *Proposition*, the latter puts forward the fact only tentatively as requiring confirmation by the reasoning with the aid of the Probans and the Instance while the former puts it forward as one fully established and thus precluding the possibility of the truth being contrary to it. This cannot be done by the *Proposition* as if it did then the rest of the Factors would be entirely futile.—*Tātparyā*

The above remarks of the *Tātparyā* show that the writer was conscious of the object on that every syllogism involves the fallacy of *Petito Principii* and has supplied a reasonable answer

When the Probans and the Instance have been duly put forward in the correct form, in the manner described above, there is no opportunity for the Opponent to urge (against the reasoning) any 'Futile Rejoinder,'—in the shape of urging contrary arguments vitiating either the similarity or the dissimilarity of the Probans—or any one of the many 'Clinchers' The Opponent who has recourse to 'Futile Rejoinder' does so (with effect) only after he has shown the doubtful character of the relation of proof and proved' between the two characters as found in the Instance and as a matter of fact a Probans is put forward as such only when its relation of 'proof and proved' to the Probandum has been duly grasped in the Instance,—and not when its mere similarity' or 'dissimilarity' to the character in the Instance has been recognised [So that when the Probans is duly stated there can be no room for Futile Rejoinder or Clinchers being urged against it]

SECTION (7)

*Factors Supplementary to Reasoning
Cogitation (Tarka)*

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

After the Factors of Reasoning it is necessary to define *Tarka*, Cogitation * This is what is declared in the next *Sūtra*

Sūtra 40

When the real character of a thing is not well known, there is put forward for the purpose of ascertaining that real character, a reasoning (in support of a certain conclusion) which indicates the presence of proof (showing the undesirability or absurdity of a contrary conclusion),—and this is called 'Cogitation

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, when the real character of a thing is not well known there is a desire to know it,—this desire appearing in

* Because this is mentioned in the opening *Sūtra* next to *Atayasa*, and also because it serves the purpose of strengthening the inferential conclusion by setting aside its contrary

The Viz Series edition has a superfluous 'tarkah' here it is absent in the Puri MSS

the form 'may I know it.' After this comes the doubt as to the thing possessing this or that particular character— one of two contradictory characters,* this doubt appearing in the form—'is this thing so and so, or is it not so and so?', and when one comes to ponder over these two contradictory characters, if he finds proofs in support of one of them, he accepts (or assents to) it,—this assent being in the form 'there are proofs supporting this fact, and as there are proofs the thing must have this character, and not the other one' †

As an example of this Cogitation, we have the following (in regard to the cognitive Soul being a product and having a beginning, or being beginningless) —First of all there arises a *desire to know* the real character of the cogniser, the agent who cognises what is to be cognised,—this desire being in the form 'may I know the real character of the cogniser'—Then comes the *doubt* in the form—'has this cogniser a beginning or is it beginningless?'—thus the real character of the thing being in doubt, and not well known, the enquirer accepts and assents to that particular character in support of which he finds proofs and grounds for acceptance. For instance (in the particular case cited) the proof would be in the following form,—'If the cogniser were beginningless, then alone would *Birth & Rebirth* and *Release* be possible for him—*Birth & Rebirth* consisting in the functioning, one after the other, of pain, birth, activity, defect and ignorance, among whom that which follows is the cause of that which precedes it, and *Release* consisting in the disappearance, one after the other, of these same (as declared in Su 1-1 2), and both of these would be impossible for him, if the cogniser had a beginning, for in that case the cogniser would be connected with a particular set of body, sense organs intellection and sensations, only when he would come into existence for the first time, so that these, body and the rest could not be the products of his

* Doubt is a necessary element in *Tarka* as it is only when there is doubt as to the presence of this or that particular character that we can have a reasoning which shows the impossibility of the presence of one and hence the certainty of the presence of the other character, and it is this reasoning that constitutes *Tarka*.

† The proof in support being in the form of the absurdity or impossibility of the other alternative.

ownpast actions, and further, anything that is born also ceases to be (very soon after), so that, becoming non-existent or destroyed, he would not be these to undergo the experiences resulting from his actions,—thus then for any one cogniser, it would be absolutely impossible to have either connection with more than one body, or disconnection (separation) from any body at all. If (in another instance) the reasoner finds no such proof forthcoming, he does not accept or assent to the conclusion*. It is reasoning of this kind that is called '*Tarka*', 'Cogitation'.

[The *Sūtra* says that *Tarka* is 'for the purpose of knowing the real character of the thing' against this an objection is raised]—"Why should this reasoning be said to be for the purpose of bringing about the true knowledge of the real character' and not to be that knowledge itself [appearing as it has been represented to do, in the form 'the thing must be so and so, and of no other kind', which is the form in which the knowledge of the real character of the things appears]?"

Our answer to this is that it would not be right for us to speak of the reasoning as embodying the knowledge itself, because as a matter of fact, it is indecisive, being purely permissive in its character,—the reasoner simply assenting to the assertion of one of the two suspected characters, on the strength of the proof adduced, and he does not (by this reasoning alone) accurately determine or decide, or ascertain that the thing must be so and so.

"How then does the reasoning serve the purpose of bringing about the knowledge of the real character of things?"

The true knowledge arises from the force of the Instrument of Cognition (which becomes fully operative and effective) when following after the reasoning, which has been duly considered and found to be free from all defects, and which appears in the form of assent to the conclusion indicated by the said Instrument

* The Viz S edition reads *tatcanyarati*, which is clearly wrong, the correct reading is *tannūnyānati*, as the Purī MS and the *Tatparyā* read

† The author puts forth several synonyms with a view to show that the form in which the reasoning appears is totally different from that of a definite, fully ascertained cognition — says the *Tatparyā*

of Cognition,* and it is in this manner that the reasoning serves the purpose of bringing about the true knowledge of the real character of things †

Thus then, we find that Cogitation serves the purpose of restoring or resuscitating the *Pramānas* or Instruments of Cognition (which have become shaken by doubts in regard to the truth of the conclusions arising from them), and (thereby) assents to and confirms those conclusions it is for this reason that it is mentioned along with '*Pramana*' in the Sutra (121) which defines *Discussion*

This Cogitation assents to or confirms the notion as to the real character of a thing whose real character is not known, i.e. the idea of the thing *as it really exists* which is what is meant by its 'real character', i.e. the character that is free from all misconceptions with regard to the thing ‡

Nirnaya Demonstrated Truth

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

In regard to the subject matter of the above-described Cogitation—

Sutra 41

"when there is an ascertainment of the real character of the thing after duly deliberating over the two sides of the question—an argument in favour of a certain conclusion and also that in its confutation§—we have what is called *Demonstrated Truth*' *Nirnaya* "

* The reading of the Viz. edition is again defective in L. 4, for *lakṣānanugraha* we should read *lakṣanādūha* as read by the Purī Mṅ by the *Tātparyā* and also by three other MṅS as mentioned in the footnote in the Viz. S. edit on

† By declaring that the true knowledge arises from the force of the Instrument of Cognition the author means to lay stress upon the fact that *Tarka* can never by itself be the independent means of any knowledge—*Tātparyā*

‡ For *tathabhāva* read *tathabhava* which gives better sense and is supported by the *Vārtika*

§ By *pakṣa* and '*pratipakṣa*' here are meant respectively—(1) the argument in favour of a certain conclusion and (2) the argument against that conclusion. Such is the interpretation by the *Bhāṣya* the *Vārtika* and the *Tātparyā*. But the *Nyāyasūtratratīkā* of Rādhāmohana takes '*pratipakṣa*' as the argument against the view opposed to the said conclusion

In regard to every matter of dispute we have two opposite views—one seeks to establish the truth of a certain conclusion with regard to the thing under investigation, and the other denies that conclusion, and seeks to confute the former view; and these two,—the arguments favouring and the arguments demolishing—are based upon—the one put forward with a view to—the ‘conclusion’ (*pakṣa*) and its ‘confutation’ (*pratipakṣa*), and the two sets of arguments themselves, when appearing together,—i.e. when put forward side by side,—come to be spoken of respectively as the ‘*pakṣa*’ (a certain view) and ‘*pratipakṣa*’ (the contrary view). And of these two views, it is necessary that one should be rejected and the other confirmed and when one is confirmed, the ‘ascertainment’ with regard to that is called ‘*Demonstrated Truth*’, *Nirnaya*.

An opponent [being misled by the terms *pakṣa*’, ‘one view’, and ‘*pratipakṣa*’, ‘contrary view’ to think that the whole definition refers to *Discussion*, and it implies the presence of an element of *Doubt*] urges the following objection.—‘It is not possible to have the said *ascertainment* by means of the *pakṣa* and *pratipakṣa*’. In every *Discussion* what happens is as follows.—(A) At first, one disputant states one view and supports it* with arguments, and rejects all the objections that the other party could bring against that view. (B) the second disputant thereupon refutes the arguments put forward by the former in support of his view, and also answers the arguments urged against the objections put forward by himself—(C) so it goes on, until one (set of arguments) stops, and when one has stopped, the other becomes established, and it is by means of this latter set of arguments *alone* (and not by both, as said in the *Sūtra*) that we have that ‘ascertainment of the real character of the thing’ which is called ‘*Demonstrated Truth*’ [So that it is not right to speak of the ‘ascertainment’ as obtained through both ‘*pakṣa* and *pratipakṣa*’], specially as in a *bona fide* discussion, both parties are equally *certain* as to the truth of their allegations, and there is no element of *Doubt* in their minds; or else, they would not engage in the *Discussion*.”

* The Viz S Edition reads a superfluous ‘*ten*’ here, which is not found either in the Puri Ms. or in the reading adopted by the *Tatparya*.

The answer to the above is that, as a matter of fact 'ascertainment' is got at through both "How is this proved?" In the following manner, we reply Every Discussion ends in showing the possibility or reasonableness of one view and the impossibility or unreasonableness of the 'confutation' of (the arguments against) that view, [or *vice versa* the reasonableness of the confutation and the unreasonableness of the original view] and it is only when we have *both* of these—the *reasonableness* and *unreasonableness*—that they *conjointly* set aside the doubt or uncertainty attaching to the *real character of the thing* while if we do not have them both, the uncertainty continues to remain

'*After deliberating*'—*i e*, after having carried on due deliberation This 'deliberation' consists in the bringing to light—*i e* formulating—the two sides of the question whereby it provides the occasion for reasonings to operate,—*i e* to be put forward (*with a view to ascertain the truth*)

What is declared here in this *Sutra* must be taken as referring to mutually contradictory views pertaining to one and the same thing When it is found that the two contradictory characters subsist in *similar* things (and not in the *same* thing) then both being possible both are accepted, for the simple reason that due investigation has shown such to be the real state of the things, for example when the definition of *Substance* is stated in the form 'Substance is that which has Motion,' it is found that a Substance, for which Motion is possible or certain, has motion,' while at the same time there are substances for which no activity is possible and these certainly 'have no motion' [so that in regard to this case both views 'Substance has motion' and 'Substance has no motion,' are admissible, and as such cannot be called 'contradictory views'] Even with regard to the same thing if the two contradictory characters are predicated in reference to different points of time then there is an option with regard to time [both being accepted as true in reference to different points of time], *e g*, the same substance which, at one time being moving is said to 'have motion,' may be admitted to 'have no motion' at another time, when either the motion may not have yet appeared, or it may have ceased

When the *Sūtra* declares, that '*Demonstrated Truth is that ascertainment which is got at after duly deliberating the two sides of a question*,' it is not meant to apply to all kinds of *Demonstrated Truth*; for in the case of Perception, which is born of the contact of the sense organ with the object, the *Demonstrated Truth* consists simply in the 'ascertainment of the object';—it is only in regard to a thing in doubt, which is under investigation [and with regard to which a Cogitation has been put forward], that *Demonstrated Truth* consists in the *ascertainment got at by duly deliberating the two sides of the question*, while lastly, in regard to the subject-matter of Discussion and the Scriptures there is no 'deliberation' (or doubt) *

Thus ends the First Daily Lesson in the First Discourse of Vātsyāyana's *Bhāṣya*

DISCOURSE I

Second Daily Lesson

LECTURE (1)

Controversy

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

† There are three kinds of Controversy—(1) Discussion, (2) Disputation and (3) Wrangling Of these—

* In the case of Perception we have neither 'deliberation' nor the 'two sides of the question',—in the case of things under investigation we have both, while in the case of Discussion, we have the 'two sides of the question,' but no 'deliberation,'—as each party is equally certain of his view, and in the case of Scriptures, there may be 'two sides', but there is no 'deliberation' or 'doubt'

‡ The *Nyāyasūtrasvarāṇa* remarks that in the case of 'Inference for one's own benefit, also, there is neither 'doubt' nor 'two sides'

† The connection of the two Daily Lessons is thus explained in the *Parasuddhi*.—The entire method of reasoning with all its accessories has been explained in the First Daily Lesson. All this reasoning helps the reasoner to arrive at a definite conclusion either by himself alone, or by holding a consultation with others. In the latter case there arise occasions for discussion and mutual criticism, and it is this latter method of arriving at a conclusion that constitutes the subject-matter of the Second Daily Lesson. Controversy, according to a certain writer, whom the *Parasuddhi* calls the *प्रौढगौडनैयायिक*, is of four kinds—*जल्प*,—*प्रतिपक्षस्थापनहीनो जल्प*;—*वादः*—*प्रतिपक्षस्थापनहीनो वादः*; while according to the "*Bāhyas*" (outsiders, i. e. *Bauddhas*) there is only one kind of Controversy.

Sūtra 1

Discussion consists in the putting forward (by two persons) of a conception and a counter conception which there is supporting and condemning by means of proofs and reasonings,—neither of which is quite opposed to the main doctrine (or thesis), and both of which are carried on in full accordance with the method of reasoning through the Five Factors.

When two contrary particular characters are alleged to subsist in the same substratum, they are called '*pakṣa* and *pratīpakṣa*', 'conception and counter conception', being, as they are, like opponents to each other, e.g. when we have two such allegations as—'soul is' and 'soul is not', when, however, the contrary characters are conceived to subsist in different substrata, they are not called 'conception and counter conception', e.g. such conceptions as 'Soul is eternal' and 'Buddhi is non eternal' '*Parigraha*', 'putting forward,' means asserting, or laying stress upon, the thing being of a particular character. And it is this asserting of two contrary characters that constitutes Discussion.

The distinctive features of this Discussion are next put forward—*In which there is supporting and condemning by means of proofs and reasonings*—i.e. in which a conception is supported by means of proofs and reasonings, and also condemned by means of proofs and reasonings, so that what is meant is that both the supporting and the condemning are done by means of proofs and reasonings * 'Supporting' here stands for establishing,

* The footnote in the Vizianagram Sans. Series says that the 'supporting' is done by means of proofs only and the 'condemning' is done by means of reasoning only. But this is contrary to what follows in the *Bhāṣya*, the *Vārtika* and the *Tatparyā*. The last says—'Though in Wrangling also there is putting forward of conception and counter conception, yet herein we have no supporting of the counter-allegation, as in Wrangling there is only demolishing of each other's positions, and no supporting at all,—though in Disputation there is supporting of the counter conception, yet the supporting and condemning are not always by means of such reasonings as have all their factors entirely valid. So that from both Wrangling and Disputation Discussion becomes distinguished by reason of its having both the supporting and condemning done in accordance with reasonings and proofs. The *Vārtika* explains the compound '*pramānatarkasādharepālambhah*' somewhat differently. It takes it as a *madhyamapadalopi* compound, expounding it as '*pramānatarkasādharepālambhulca*'—i.e. the supporting is done by means of proofs and reasonings and the condemnation of that supporting is also done by means of proofs and reasonings.

and 'condemning' for denying or rejecting. These two, 'supporting' and 'condemning' of the two conceptions, proceed hand in hand, in a connected manner,—until one of the two conceptions becomes rejected and another established, so that there is ultimately 'condemnation' of that which has been rejected and 'supporting' of that which remains unshaken.

As a rule *Clinchers* are employed in Disputation, so that their use is precluded from Discussion. But even though Clinchers are, as a body, precluded from Discussion, yet the use of some of them is permitted,—that is what is meant by the qualification 'not opposed to the main doctrine', *—for instance, it is permitted to employ, in Discussion, the Clincher, in the shape of the Fallacy of 'Contradiction,' which has been defined (in Sū 1-2 6) as 'that which contradicts the accepted thesis.' Similarly the qualification 'carried on in full accordance with the method of reasoning through the Five Factors' has been added with a view to indicate that it is permitted to employ in Discus-

* The *Vartika* does not accept this interpretation, according to it this qualification is meant to exclude the *Aparasiddhanta*.

The *Parisuddhi* thus explains the difference in the two interpretations.—We have a general rule that 'no animals should be killed, then we have the exception 'the *Agnisomya* animal should be killed' so here we have the general rule that in वाद no clinchers are to be put forward and then there is the exception that the *Aparasiddhanta* clincher should be urged. Thus according to the Bhasya. According to the *Vartika* the sense is that there is a natural tendency to urge all clinchers in वाद; and hence there is the exclusive selection of the *Aparasiddhanta* as the only one of the clinchers to be urged.

The *Parisuddhi* goes on—'From among the 22 clinchers there are six that cannot by their very nature, be urged in वाद—(1) प्रतिज्ञाहानि, (2) प्रतिज्ञासन्वास, (3) निरर्थक (4) अर्थान्तर, (5) अविज्ञातार्थ and (6) अपार्यक,—there are seven which even though possible, should not be urged—(1) प्रतिज्ञा-न्तर, (2) हेत्वन्तर, (3) अज्ञान, (4) अप्रतिमा, (5) विक्षेप, (6) सत्तादुष्ट, (7) पथेयु-योज्योपेक्षण;—there are seven again which may be urged—(1) विरोध, (2) अप्राप्तकाल, (3) न्यून, (4) अधिक, (5) पुनरुक्त, (6) अनुभाषण, (7) अपसिद्धान्त,—there are two which, when urged put an end to the controversy—(1) हेत्वा-मास, (2) निरनुयोज्यानुयोग.

sion, the two Clinchers of 'Deficiency,'—which is defined as 'that which is wanting in any one of the factors of reasoning' (Sū 5-2-12)—and 'Redundance'—defined as 'that which puts forward superfluous Probanda and Example' (Sū 5-2-13)

{One purpose of the term 'in which the supporting and condemning are by means of proofs and reasonings' having been already explained, the *Bhāṣya* proceeds to point out other purposes served by the same term }—(1) Even though 'proofs and reasonings' are included among the 'Factors' [so that the presence of 'proofs and reasonings' is already implied in the qualification 'in accordance with reasoning through the Five Factors'], yet proofs and reasonings have been added separately, with a view to indicate that the proofs and reasonings urged by the two parties should be inter related (and not independent of one another), otherwise it would have to be regarded as 'Discussion' when both parties go on urging arguments, each in support of his own view (without any regard to arguments propounded by the other) *—(2) In some cases, it is found that even without the use of the 'Factors of Reasoning', several Proofs accomplish their purpose (of determining the real nature of things); so that it would be real Discussion also when the 'supporting' and 'condemning' are carried on by means of such proofs (as are independent of the Factors) —and it is this fact that is indicated by the adding of the term 'by means of proofs and reasonings' [while, in the absence of this term, the said form of Discussion would not be included in the definition, which, in that case, would make the presence of the 'five factors' essential] —(3) Lastly, the term 'in accordance with proofs and reasonings' has been added for the purpose of precluding the notion that Disputation does not admit of those Clinchers that are employed in Discussion,—Disputation being defined (in the next Sūtra) as 'that in which the supporting and condemning are carried on by means of Casuistry, Futile Rejoinder and Clinchers', that is to say, this definition of Disputation might

* For instance, when one party goes on propounding, from his own standpoint arguments in support of the eternity of Sound, and the other person putting forward from his point of view alone, arguments in support of its non-eternity, and neither takes any account of the arguments urged by the other

give rise to the notion that Disputation is that wherein the supporting and condemning are carried on by means of Casuistry &c only (and never by means of proofs and reasonings), while wherever the supporting and condemning are carried on by means of proofs and reasonings, it is *Discussion* always (and never *Disputation*),—and with a view to preclude this notion, the Sūtra has added the term 'by means of proofs and reasonings' [The sense being that, as a matter of fact, some of the Clinchers employed in Discussion may be employed in Disputation and *vice versa*, and yet there is this distinction that, in Discussion the supporting and condemning are done strictly in accordance with proofs and reasonings, while in Disputation they are done by means of Casuistry etc, also]

Sūtra 2

Jaḥpa Disputation

Disputation is that which is endowed with the said characteristics and in which there is supporting and condemning by means of Casuistry, Futile Rejoinder and Clinchers (also)

BHĀṢYA

'Endowed with the said characteristics — i.e. (a) it puts forward a conception and counter conception — (b) consists in supporting and condemning by means of proofs and reasonings, — (c) is not opposed to the main doctrine — and (d) is carried on in full accordance with the method of reasoning through Five Factors

'In which there is supporting and condemning by means of Casuistry &c' — i.e. the peculiarity of Disputation (as distinguished from Discussion) lies in this that here the supporting as well as the condemning are done also by means of Casuistry Futile Rejoinder and Clinchers

An objection is raised — 'As a matter of fact, no supporting of anything is ever done by means of Casuistry Futile Rejoinder and Clinchers, all these serve the purpose only of condemning (or opposing) things, as is distinctly expressed in their general definitions as well as detailed classifications. For instance, the general definitions of these (as provided in the *Nyāya Sūtra*) are—

(a) 'Casuistry consists in opposing an assertion through the assumption of an alternative meaning' (1 2 18),—(b) 'Futile Rejoinder consists in opposing an assertion through similarity and dissimilarity' (1 2 10)—and (c) 'Clincher consists in the indicating of the disputant's misunderstanding and failing to understand the point at issue' (1 2 19), and in the detailed classification of each of these also it is clear that every one of them serves the purpose of only opposing assertions. There is nothing in the Sutra as we have it from which one could understand that Casuistry &c. serve to *support* conceptions through opposing (their contraries) this sense could be got at only if we had the Sutra in the form that 'in Disputation, *opposing* is by means of Casuistry &c.' (dropping the term '*supporting*' altogether).'

[The answer to the above objection is as follows]—As a matter of fact, both *supporting* and *condemning* are done by means of *proofs*, and Casuistry, &c., come in only as auxiliaries serving the purpose of guarding one's own view, and they never, by themselves serve as the means of supporting. That is to say when a person *supports* by means of proofs, Casuistry Futile Rejoinder and Clinchers are employed as auxiliaries,† serving as they do the purpose of guarding one's own view,—as a matter of fact whenever these are employed they guard one's own view by attacking or opposing the other view. This is exactly what is declared later on in the Sutra—'Disputation and Wrangling serve the purpose of safeguarding the conception of truth—just as the fencing of thorny boughs serves the purpose of safeguarding the sprouting of seeds' (4-2-50). Similarly when a person *condemns* a counter conception by means of proofs, if he employs Casuistry &c., they become helpful in setting aside or warding off the attacks that might be made against that condemnation. So that Casuistry, &c., are employed only as subsidiary auxiliaries; [there is this difference, however that] as regards *supporting* they never by themselves serve as the direct means (always serv

† The words न स्वतन्त्राणां साधनभावे यत् तत् प्रमाणैरप्यस्य साधने तत्र छलजातिनिग्रहस्थानानामप्राभावे स्वपक्षरक्षणार्थत्वात् are wanting in the Paris manuscript but this must be due to लेखकप्रमाद, caused by the same word रक्षणार्थत्वात् occurring twice

ing as subsidiary auxiliaries),—but as regards *condemning*, they do by themselves, serve as the direct means also *

Vitandā-Wrangling

Sūtra 3

That same Disputation is Wrangling when there is no establishing of the counter-conception †

BHĀṢYA

The aforesaid Disputation becomes 'Wrangling',—with this further qualification that it is without any establishing of the counter-conception. That is to say, out of the above described two allegations in regard to two contrary characters as subsisting in the same substratum,—which have been called above, 'conception and counter conception'—the Wrangler does not establish one (that which he himself holds), but only goes on to criticise the (proofs adduced for establishing the) conception of the other person.

"In that case the definition of Wrangling had better be stated in the form that it is that Disputation *which is without a counter conception*" §

But as a matter of fact, the statement that the Wrangler makes in attacking his opponent's view could constitute his own 'view', and what is meant (by there being no establishing of the counter-conception) is that he does not proceed to establish the proposition which he lays down as to be proved by himself. And

* The *Vartika* has taken exception to the whole of this question and answer in the *Bhāṣya*. It is interesting to note that the न्यायसूत्रविवरण takes माधनोपालम्भ as साधनाय उपालम्भ *attacking for the purpose of supporting*.

† The 'Sacred Books of the Hindus' edition reads the *Sūtra* as 'स्वमतिरक्ष'. This is not supported by any of the available commentaries, nor by the Purī manuscripts, nor by the explanations given by the *Bhāṣya*, the *Vartika* and the *Tatparya*. The last says—"The conception of the critic himself is what is called *counter-conception* here,—as opposed to the view that he is criticizing."

§ When there is no establishing of the critic's own view, it follows that he has no view of his own to establish, for unless an attempt is made by a person to establish a certain idea the idea cannot be called a 'pakṣa', a view.

(for this reason) it is better to have the definition as it stands in the Sūtra. *

SECTION (2)

Of the Fallacious Probans

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The '*Hetvābhāsas*,' 'Fallacious Probans', are so called because they do not possess all the characteristics of the true Probans, and yet they are sufficiently similar to the Probans to appear as such. And these—

Sūtra 4

(1) The *Savyabhicāra* (Inconclusive), (2) The *Viruddha* (Contradictory), (3) The *Prakaranasama* (Neutralised), (4) The *Sādhya*sama (unknown), and the *Kālātita* (Mistimed)—are the Fallacious Probans

The Inconclusive Probans (1)

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

From among the aforesaid five Fallacious Probans—

Sūtra 5

† The Inconclusive is that which is tainted by indecision.

* When the wrangler confines himself to merely criticising the opponent's view, he does so with the idea that when the opponent's view has been rejected as wrong it would follow as a necessary consequence that his own view is right, so that he does have a view of his own, but it is stated in wrangling, only in the form of the attack on the other view—this 'criticism' being figuratively spoken of as his 'view'—So that the meaning is that though the wrangler has a view of his own yet he does not make any attempt at establishing it apart from the attack that he directs against the other view. Hence it is only right to speak of there being no establishing of his own view, but it would be wrong to say that there is no other view—*Tātparyā*

† The term अनैकान्तिक is explained by the व्याख्यानकारेण as follows—'एकस्य, साध्यस्य साध्याभावस्य वा 'अन्ते' अधिकरणमात्रे यमिष्टानि स 'एकान्तः' इदं 'अनैकान्त' एवमिदं अन्ते यो नियतः स एकान्तः—says the *Bhāṣya* below. On this the *Tātparyā* remarks that the terms 'inconclusive' and 'indecisive' being synonymous—which is the term defined and which is the defining term should vary with the student. If he knows the meaning of 'inconclusive' and not that of 'indecisive' then the latter shall be for him the defined term and the former the defining term, and so vice versa.

The term 'vyabhicāra', 'indecision', means *non fixity on any one point* *, and that which is accompanied by this 'indecision' is the 'indecisive'. As for example, in the reasoning 'Sound is eternal because it is intangible—the jar which is tangible has been found to be non eternal,—and Sound is not tangible,—therefore, being intangible, Sound must be eternal'—we find that the character of *intangibility* has been put forward as proving the character of *eternality* while as a matter of fact the two characters do not bear to each other the relation of *proof and proved* (Probans and Probandum), [as all non eternal things are not tangible, e.g. Buddhi is non eternal and yet it is intangible] for we find that the Atom is tangible and yet eternal. If the Soul and such other things (which combine *eternality* with *intangibility*) be cited as the instance (supporting the reasoning), then—inasmuch as the Probans has been defined (above, in Sū 1 1-34) as 'that which establishes the Probandum through similarity to the instance',—'intangibility' will have to be regarded as the Probans, and this would be found to be not necessarily concomitant with *eternality*,—e.g. in the case of Buddhi, which is intangible and yet non eternal. So that in both kinds of instance [in that of *dissimilarity* in the case of jar cited before which is tangible and non eternal,—and in that of *similarity* as in the case of Soul, which is intangible and eternal] there is 'indecision non concomitance between *intangibility* and *eternality* and thus they cannot be accepted to be related as probans and probandum and thus, not fulfilling the conditions of the Probans what is cited in the above reasoning cannot be a true Probans.

[If the term अनैकान्तिक be taken as embodying the definition and 'सव्यभिचार' as the term defined in that case the word अनैकान्तिक should be explained as follows]—In the reasoning cited 'eternality is one 'anta', point, and 'non eternality' is another one 'anta', point, that which subsists in is concomitant with—one point would be 'ekānta', one pointed and the contrary (that is not concomitant with one) would be 'anaikānta', not one pointed, as this would be concomitant with both (the Probandum *eternality*, and its contrary, *non-eternality*)

* I E When a probans is found to be concomitant with neither the probandum only nor the negation of the probandum only—but with both—then it is said to be tainted by vyabhicāra or indecision

Sūtra 6

The Contradictory Probans (2)

A certain doctrine (or view) having been accepted, the probans that is contradictory to it is called the 'Contradictory'

BHĀṢYA

The term '*tadvirodhi*', 'contradictory to it', means *the which contradicts it i.e.* that which contradicts (sets aside, renders impossible*) the doctrine that has been accepted. E.g. [When the author of the *Yogabhāṣya* on *Yogasūtra* III 13† makes the two statements]—'This world, being a modification ceases from manifestation because its eternality is denied'—and—'Even when thus ceasing it continues to exist, because its utter destruction is denied'. Here we find that what the Probans in the former reasoning—'because its eternality is denied'—means is that 'no modification can be eternal', and this is certainly contradictory to the doctrine enunciated in the second statement that 'even when ceasing, the modification continues to exist'. 'How?' Well, the 'manifestation' of a thing is only the *attaining of existence* and 'ceasing' is *falling off* so that if the modification *when fallen off (apeta, ceasing) from its existence (vyakṣeh, from manifestation)*, does 'continue to exist', then it is not possible to deny its eternality, because the very fact that the modification continues to exist even after manifestation should constitute its *eternality*, and 'denial of its eternality' should necessarily imply the possibility of the modification falling off from its existence, as it is only what actually falls off from existence that has been found to be non-eternal, while that which *still exists* does not fall off from existence,—so that 'continuing to exist' and 'falling off from existence' are two mutually contradictory concepts, and as such can never co-exist. Thus it is found that the Probans put forward ('denial of eternality') actually sets aside the

* In *Bhāṣya* on *Sū* 5 2-4 is contradicted has been explained as 'is rendered impossible'.

† The real words of the योगभाष्य are तदेतन् नैलोक्य विवाये etc. as quoted in the *Vārtika*.

very doctrine (of continuity of existence) on whose basis it is put forward *

Sūtra 7

(3) The Neutralised Probans—the Third Fallacious Probans

The Neutralised Probans is that which is put forward to establish a definite conclusion, while it is one that only gives rise to suspense (and vacillation) in regard to the point at issue

BHĀṢYA

The term '*prakarana*' point at issue', stands for the two opposite views on a doubtful question, neither of which is definitely ascertained,—the '*cintā*', 'suspense', in regard to such point at issue, consists in that desire to ascertain the truth, that whole process of investigation, which, starting with the doubt, ends with the definitive cognition,—now that Probans which really only gives rise to the said suspense if put forward as leading to

* There is a marked difference between the Bhāṣya's account of the Contradictory Probans and that given by the later Logicians. It is clear from the Bhāṣya that what is meant is that the Probans is contradictory to some doctrine that its propounder has already accepted. The later Logicians define it as *that which proves the contradictory of the proposition which it is put forward to prove*. The earliest mention of this later view is found in the *Vārtika*, which puts it forward as an alternative explanation of the definition given in the Sūtra. The words of the Sūtra afford directly the meaning assigned to them in the Bhāṣya but how the words may be made to yield the later view is thus explained in the न्यायभूतविवरण—वादिना न्यायादिबोधित सिद्धान्त तत्प्रतिज्ञातसाध्यरूपमभ्युपेत्य—अनूद्य—तद्वशनाय प्रयुक्तं तद्विरोधी साध्यभावस्याप्यमकृतहेतु विरुद्धः । [When the opponent repeats the view he is going to refute and then propounds the refuting reason, this reason is contradictory.] अथवा साध्यमभ्युपेत्य उद्दिश्य तत्साधनाय प्रयुक्तो यो वस्तुगत्या साध्यभावव्याप्यो हेतुः । [That which really happens to prove a conclusion contrary to what it is meant to prove.] The former of these two explanations is not right, the latter represents the generally accepted view.

The *Pārsavidhi* thus distinguishes '*Virodha*' from '*Apaisiddhanta*'—'We have *Apaisiddhanta* when the assertion made goes against what the speaker himself has declared previously on the basis of a more authoritative *pramāṇa*, while there is *Virodha* when the assertion itself contains within itself the elements of contradiction, when one part of it asserts one thing and another part a totally contradictory thing.'

definitive cognition, does not differ (in point of being doubtful) from the point at issue; as both sides would be equal (equally doubtful), and thus being *similar (sama)* to the point at issue (*prakarana*), it does not lead to any definite conclusion *

Example—'Sound is non eternal, because we do not find in it the properties of the eternal thing, and we have found, in the case of such things as the Dish and the like, that what is not found to possess the properties of an eternal thing is non eternal.'

That reasoning, in which what is put forward as the Probans is the character that is admitted (by both parties) to be common (to the Probandum and its Reverse), is 'equal to doubt' (in not leading to a certain conclusion); and such a Probans, therefore, has been called 'Indecisive',—[in the case of the *Prakaranasama*], on the other hand, what gives rise to the '*prakarana*', the point at issue, is (not Doubt but) only that factor of Doubt which consists in the fact of there being found nothing which could favour either of the two opposite views, e.g. in regard to the reasoning cited we find that in Sound, properties of an eternal thing are not found, just as properties of a non-eternal thing are not found, and this not finding of peculiarities favouring either of the two views

* The two opposite views, which constitute the point at issue, have been here called '*prakarana*' in the sense that these views are what are made the probandum (*sādhyaena prakṛiyate*) by the two parties. The 'suspense in regard to these views is due to the real truth on the point being not known, e.g. when a man puts forward the fallacious reasoning—'Sound is non-eternal because the properties of an eternal thing are not found in it'—the person to whom this is addressed falls into a suspense as he does not find, in Sound, either such properties as are invariably concomitant with eternality or such as are inseparable from non-eternality, having therefore his doubts thus aroused he proceeds to enquire and investigate. So that the urging of the non finding of the properties of an eternal thing, as brought forward to prove eternality,—while it leads only to a doubt as to eternality and non-eternality,—constitutes the Fallacious Probans called '*Prakaranasama*'.

Both sides would be equal—i.e. just as the not finding of the properties of the eternal thing would indicate non-eternality, exactly in the same manner would the not finding of the properties of a non-eternal thing indicate eternality. The explanation of the term as *similar to the point at issue* (*prakaranasama*) is only by way of indicating what the etymology of the word signifies, it is not meant that similarity to the point at issue constitutes the denotation of the term, in fact what the term really denotes is only being neutralised (having an opponent equally strong)—*Tātparya*

gives rise to 'suspense in regard to the point at issue.' "How? Because in the contrary case (*i.e.* in the case of our finding peculiarities favouring either of the two views), there would be an end to the 'point at issue' (one of the views being definitely ascertained), for example, if we actually found, in Sound, properties of the *eternal* thing, it would no longer be a 'point at issue', or if we found in it properties of the *non-eternal* thing then also it would cease to be a 'point at issue' Thus then we find that, inasmuch as such a Probans gives rise to (lends support to) both the opposite views, it cannot lead to a definitive cognition in regard to either one of them *

Sūtra 8

(4) The Unknown Probans

The Unknown Probans is that which being still to be proved, is not different from the Probandum †

* The difference between the Inconclusive and the Neutralised probans as brought out in the Bhasya is thus explained in the *Tatparya*—The Probans in the reasoning Sound is non-eternal because properties of an eternal thing are not found in it would be called Inconclusive only if the *not finding of the properties of an eternal thing* were known to subsist in a thing which is admitted by both parties to be *eternal* or the *not finding of the properties of the non-eternal thing* were known to subsist in a thing admitted by both parties to be *non-eternal*. As it is however neither of these two conditions is fulfilled by the case cited in which all that we have is that in Sound there is *not finding of the properties of the eternal thing* and also the *not finding of the properties of the non-eternal thing* that is all and these two circumstances neutralising one another we call the Probans neutralised.

† That whose subsistence in the Subject is as unsettled as that of the Probandum—says the न्यायसूत्रविवरण. The *Tatparya* has the following notes on the text of the Sūtra—"The definition here provided is meant to include all the four kinds of असिद्ध—स्वरूपासिद्ध, एकदेशासिद्ध, आश्रयासिद्ध, अन्यथासिद्ध, as every one of them is *still to be proved* and as such similar to the Probandum. If the definition had been stated simply as—the *sūdhyaśama* Probans is that which is unknown then we could not include in this that Probans which is unknown to only one of the parties (and *known* to the other) while this becomes included when we add साध्यावशिष्ट, as the Probandum also is unknown to only one of the two parties. And if we had only the term साध्यावशिष्ट then this would apply to the अन्यतरासिद्ध only, as it is only this that is exactly similar to the Probandum—in that both are unknown

BHĀṢYA

[As an example of this Fallacious Probans, we have the reasoning]—‘Shadow is a substance’,—the Probandum, to prove which is put forward the Probans ‘because it has ‘motion’, and this Probans does not differ from the Probandum, inasmuch as it is still to be proved, and hence it is an ‘Unknown’ Probans. Because that Shadow ‘has motion’ is not known, and it has got to be made known, just as much as the Probandum (that Shadow is a substance). What has got to be ‘known’ or ascertained is the following—‘Does the shadow move, like the man?’ or is it that as the object obstructing the light moves along, there is a continuity of the obstruction, which leads to the continuity of the *absence of the light*, and it is this *absence of light* which is perceived (as the shadow)? What actually happens is that as the object moves along, it obstructs certain portions of light, and what is perceived as ‘shadow’ is only the continued absence of those portions of light that are obstructed (by the moving object) as ‘obstruction is only negation of approach’ *

Sutra 9

(5) *The Belated or Mistimed Probans*

The Belated or Mistimed Probans is that which, as adduced, is behind time

before proof (by one party only) and both become known after proof, and all the other kinds of ‘unknown’ would become excluded. Hence the Sutra has added the term ‘*śādhyaḥ*’, *being still to be proved* the Probandum also is still to be proved, or else it would not be a ‘probandum’ at all, hence the Probans is called unknown because it is still to be proved and some of the ‘unknown’ are such as are wanting in proof only temporarily (such as अन्यतरादि) while others have this want permanently not being capable of being proved at all, and to this latter class belong the स्वरूपासक्त and the आश्रयासिद्ध. It might seem that the definition applies to all that is to be proved and hence it applies to the Probandum also. But we should not lose sight of the fact that the definition has to be taken as subject to the general definition of ‘Fallacious Probans’ so what the definition means is that the ‘Unknown’ is that probans which etc. etc. and this cannot apply to the Probandum.

* In the last sentence the readings adopted in the body of the text are defective the correct readings are supplied in the footnotes, and these are supported by the two Purī Mss. also

BHĀṢYA

When one factor of the thing adduced as Probans is found to be affected by lapse of time, it is said to be adduced 'behind time;' and it is then called 'Belated' Example—'Sound is eternal, because it is manifested by conjunction, like Colour, the Colour that is manifested by the conjunction of light with the jar is one that was in existence before, as well as after, its manifestation; similarly the Sound also that is manifested by the conjunction of the drum and the stick, or by the conjunction of the wood and the axe, is one that is in existence before and after its manifestation; so that, being manifested by conjunction, Sound must be regarded as eternal'—This is not a valid Probans, because when adduced, it is behind time.* In the case of Colour, the time at which the

* It is clear from this passage and from the explanation of the कालतीति हेत्वाभास as given here and in the *Vartika*, that the conception of this fallacy has undergone a complete change at the hands of the later logicians. The latter regard that Probans as कालाव्ययापदिष्ट which is found to be opposed to a well-ascertained fact, when, for instance, the coolness of fire is adduced as Probans, in accordance with this view they have given to their fallacy the name of बाधित, 'annulled' while what the *Bhāṣya* means is that we have the कालतीति fallacy when one part of the Probans is found to be such as is not true at the time in connection with which it is put forward, e.g. 'manifested by conjunction,' as adduced to prove the eternity of sound, is found to be a Probans of which one part, conjunction is not present at the time that Sound appears, though it was there before that appearance so that it is behind time, 'belated' The name कालतीति—Belated—can rightly be applied to only this, the बाधित of the moderns was never true, so that the name 'belated' cannot apply to it. With a view to meet this discrepancy between the two views the *Tatparya* has adopted the method of a very forced interpretation of the *Bhāṣya*. It says that the opening sentence of the *Bhāṣya* states both views—the '*svamata*,' his own view, as also the '*paramata*,' the view of others, the *Tatparya* taking care to brand what clearly is the *Bhāṣya* view as '*paramata*,' and the modern view as '*svamata*' and it gets the two views out of the two meanings of the word *artha*, 'thing,' in the *Bhāṣya*. According to the view of the *Tatparya*, 'thing' stands for the Subject of the Proposition, in which the Probans should subsist, and the Subject—like every other thing—has two factors, the thing itself and its qualities: and when one of these factors—the quality—is found to be affected by lapse of time, we call it 'belated', e.g. when coolness of fire is urged as proving its eternity, we find that the coolness, which is adduced

manifesting conjunction appears does not go beyond (i.e. does not differ from) that at which the manifested colour exists; as it is only during the time at which the conjunction of the light and jar is present that colour is perceived; while Colour is not perceived when the conjunction has ceased to exist. The case of Sound, however, is entirely different; for instance, it is only after the conjunction of the drum and stick has ceased that sound is heard by the man at a distance, in fact it is heard at the time of the Disjunction (i.e. at the time that the stick has ceased to touch the drum); so that the manifestation of Sound is *beyond the time*

as a quality of the subject, *Fire*, is 'belated,' because its contrary has been already definitely ascertained. By the view of the *Bhāṣya* itself the 'thing' is the *Probans* itself, and it is called 'belated,' when not the whole of it, but only a part of it is found to be *behind time* as in the case of the *Probans* 'manifested by conjunction', where it is found that though the *manifestation* is true, the *conjunction* has passed off when the sound appears. And when the *Tātparyya* finds the example given in the *Bhāṣya* not fitting in with its own view, it seeks to meet this difficulty by saying that the example according to the true view has not been given in the *Bhāṣya* because several examples of it have already been given, when for instance it has been said that no conclusion can be deduced from what is contrary to well-ascertained facts of perception or to scripture, so that the *Bhāṣya* cites an example only according to the *paramatā*. This method, however, is not quite in keeping with the practice of *Bhāṣyas*. All *Bhāṣyas*—that of *Vātsyāyana* among them—err more on the side of diffuseness than of conciseness.

The *Bhāṣya* view really does not lend support to the modern view of the fallacy of Annulment, if only a *part* of the *Probans* is 'behind time,' it cannot be said to be contrary to, and hence *annulled* by, well ascertained facts of perception etc., so in order to remove this difficulty, the *Tātparyya* has taken the term 'one part' of the *Bhāṣya* to refer to the *Subject*, and not to the *Probans*. As regards the objection that might be urged against the *Bhāṣya* that it does not—if its own explanation of the *Sūtra* is accepted—mention the 'annulled' at all among the *Fallacious probans*,—it has to be borne in mind that a true *Fallacious Probans* is that which has some semblance of being a valid *Probans*, and as a matter of fact, anything so absurd as the *coolness of fire* cannot be said to have any 'semblance' to a valid *Probans*. Then again, it has to be borne in mind that we can apply the term 'behind time' or 'belated' to only what was true before, but is not true at the time in connection with that with which it is adduced, and this also can never apply to anything so absurd as *coolness of fire*. So that the modern view would appear to be unsupported, not only by the *Bhāṣya* and the *Vātsyāyana*, but also by the *Sūtra*.

of the conjunction, and as such it cannot be *caused* by that conjunction, because as a rule when the *cause* has ceased to exist, the *effect* does not appear [so that if conjunction were the cause of the manifestation of Sound, the latter should cease after the former has ceased] Thus then, it is found that what is adduced as the Probans is not 'similar to the example', and as such it cannot prove the Proposition—hence it is a Fallacious Probans *.

[The Bauddha logician has defined the 'Belated Probans' as that which is adduced at a time other than that at which it should be adduced, e.g. when one party has urged the reasoning simply as 'Sound is eternal, like the jar', and he adduces the Probans, 'because it is a product', only *after* he has been asked 'Why?' Having thus explained and exemplified the *Sūtra*, the Bauddha has found fault with it as follows—The question—'Why?'—that the Opponent puts—is it put *after* the first party has completed his say, or *before* that? If the former, then the first party is open to the clincher of 'Deficiency', his reasoning being *deficient* in that it does not state the Probans at all, and hence it cannot be a case of Fallacious Probans being urged. If on the other hand the question is put *before* the first party has completed his say, then the Probans does not cease to be a truly valid Probans, simply because it is urged after some time; if it fulfils all the conditions of the valid Probans, it does not lose its validity simply because of the interruption by the over zealous Opponent. This is met by the *Bhāṣya* by rejecting the suggested interpretation of the *Sūtra*]—The *Sūtra* does not mean that belatedness' consists in the

* The *Tatparya* remarks that the Fallacious Probans as here explained would only be a form of the *Unknown Probans*, and as such the 'Belated' should be the same as the 'Unknown', and the fact that even though this objection should have been brought forward by the *Bhāṣya* if the explanation provided by the *Bhāṣya* was really *paramata*, yet it has not been urged—has been met by the specious reasoning that the defect was so apparent that the *Bhāṣya*, did not think it worth while to urge it. But we have to remember that the 'Belated' as explained by the *Bhāṣya*, is not included in any of the three kinds of 'Unknown' accepted by the older logicians स्वरूपासिद्ध आध्यासिद्ध and अन्ययासिद्ध (see above), it falls under what the later logicians have called the भागासिद्ध the *partly 'unknown'*, of which however no mention is found either in the *Bhāṣya* or in the *Vartika*.

reversing of the order of the Factors of Reasoning Why? Because we have the general law that—'when one thing is by its inherent capability connected with another thing, the connection subsists also when they are remote from one another, and on the contrary, when the two things are not connected at all, mere proximity is ineffective',—and according to this law even when the Probans is stated in an order other than the usual one, it does not lose its character of the 'Probans'—which consists in its *similarity* or *dissimilarity* to the Example (Su. 4-1-34 and 35), and so long as it does not lose the character of the 'Probans', it cannot be called a 'Fallacious' Probans. And further, the 'reversing of the order of the Factors' is what has been stated (in Su. 5-2-11) as constituting the *Clincher* of 'Inopportune', so that if the same were mentioned here (as a 'Fallacious Probans'), that would be a needless repetition. Thus we conclude that such is not the meaning of the Sūtra *

SECTION 3

CASUISTRY

Sūtras 10—17

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Next we proceed to describe *Casuistry* †

* The examples of 'annulment' by the more authoritative contrary cognition of the Subject are thus supplied by the *Pārisuddhi*—(1) 'The jar is all pervading because it is an entity like Ākāśa'—when the all pervadingness of the jar is opposed to what we know of the jar by preception—(2) 'the atom is made of component parts because it is corporeal, like the jar'—where the conclusion is opposed to what we know of the atom by inference—(3) the Meru consists of stone, because it is a mountain like the Vindhya—where the conclusion is opposed to what we know of the Meru from the scriptures. The following is an example of the annulment of the conception of the Probans as adduced—(1) 'Water and Air are hot, because their touch is different from that of Earth like Fire'—where the fact of the touch of Air being different from that of Earth is opposed to our perception and so on.

† The sequence is thus explained by the *Pārisuddhi*—When the disputant finds that his reasoning is vitiated by a fallacy, and he finds himself unable to remove the fallaciousness, he, still desperately trying to snatch victory to himself puts forward improper answers—of which there are two kinds—Casuistry and Futile Rejoinder. The former comes first as though wrong in sense, it is verbally and apparently right while *Jāti* is more absurd as it involves the contradiction of one's own assertions.

Sūtra 10

Casuistry consists in opposing a proposition by assigning it a meaning other than the one intended

It is not possible to cite specific examples in connection with the general definition; they will be cited along with the definition of the several kinds of Casuistry.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The division of Casuistry is as follows—

Sūtra 11

It is of three kinds—(A) Vākchala, Verbal Casuistry, (B) Sāmānyacchala, Generalising Casuistry, and (C) Upacāra cchala, Figurative Casuistry —

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

From among these—

Sūtra 12

(A) Verbal Casuistry consists in assuming a meaning other than that intended to be conveyed by a word,—when the meaning (intended) is not definitely specified

For instance, when the proposition is put forward in the form—‘*Navakambalo*’ *yam māṇavakah*,’ where what the speaker means is that ‘the young boy is one whose blanket is new,’ the compound word ‘*navakambalah*’ being equivalent to the expression ‘*navah kambalo yasya*,’—though this latter uncompounded expression sufficiently clearly defines the particular idea desired to be conveyed, the same is not done by the compounded word ‘*navakambalah*’ (which is ambiguous, being capable of affording more than one meaning);—and what the Casuist does is to assign to the compounded word a meaning other than the one intended by the speaker, and expounding the compound as ‘*nava kambalāḥ yasya*,’ takes it to mean that the young boy is one who has nine blankets, and says—‘you say that the young boy has nine blankets’;—having thus imposed upon the man an idea that he never intended to convey, he proceeds to oppose the assertion by showing its absurdity—‘this boy has only one blanket, where are the nine blankets?’ Thus this is a case of Casuistry which is urged on the occasion of an ambiguous word being used; and being based upon a word, it is called ‘Verbal’ Casuistry

This Casuistry is to be met by urging the necessity of the Casuist himself pointing out the peculiar circumstances favouring his own interpretation of the ambiguous word, for instance, the word '*Naṣṣakambalaḥ*' is ambiguous,—signifying 'one who has a new blanket' and also 'one who has nine blankets', under the circumstances, when you take it to mean 'one who has nine blankets' (and then turn to me and say that the man has only one blanket, and not nine), this is hardly fair, as it is necessary to point out the peculiar circumstances that favour either of the two possible significations,—from the statement of which peculiar circumstances it would be known that the word (in the context in question) expressed that particular meaning,—as a matter of fact you have no such peculiar circumstances that you could urge (in favour of your own interpretation), so that what you have brought against us is a false and futile attack *

Further, the connection of a word with its denotation is well known in the world to consist in the conventional restriction of a certain word having a certain denotation—in the form that 'of such and such a verbal expression such and such is the denotation', and this conventional restriction is found to be general (wide) in the case of general terms, and particular (specialised) in the case of particular terms, and whenever these words are used, they are used according to previous usage, and never in a way in which they have never been used before, the use of a word again is only for the purpose of bringing about the cognition of its meaning, and it is only when the meaning has been comprehended that there follows any activity (as resulting from the hearing of that word) Thus the use of words being for the sake of bringing about the comprehension of its meaning, the exact usage of the general term is determined by the force (of circumstances), i.e. when such expressions are used as—'take the goat to the village,' bring *butter*', 'feed the *Brāhmaṇa*'—every one of these words ('goat', 'butter' and 'brāhmaṇa') is a general or common term and yet it is applied, in actual usage, to particular individuals composing what is denoted by that term, and to what particular individuals it is applied is determined by the force of circumstances, the term is applied to that particular

* The Puri MS reads '*adhiyoga*' for *nyoga*

individual (goat, for instance) with which it is found possible to connect the direction of the particular activity (*of taking to village, for instance*), it being absolutely impossible for the entire community (*of all goats &c.*) to be connected with the direction expressed by the words [*'take to the village'*]. [*no one man at any one time could take to a village all the goats that there are in the world, all of which are denoted by the general term 'goat'*] Similarly the term under discussion,—*'navakambalah'* is a general term [as it has two significations], and as such, when it is used it has to be taken as applied to that to which it has the capability to apply, under the circumstances,—so that when it is addressed in regard to a person having only one *new* blanket, it has to be taken as signifying 'one who has a new blanket' and under the circumstances, the *possessing of nine blankets* being found impossible, the word cannot signify 'one who has nine blankets' Thus when you assign to your opponent a word a meaning that it cannot possibly convey, your attack must be regarded as entirely futile *

Sutra 13

(B) Generalising Casuistry consists in the urging of an absurd signification, which is rendered possible by the use of a too generic term

BHĀṢYA

When one man says—'Oh this Brahmana is endowed with learning and character' and another replies—'learning and character are quite natural to a Brahmana'—the latter assertion is met by opposition, by assigning to the word (*'Brāhmaṇa'*) a

* At the time that the exact denotation is fixed by convention for the first time it is not said to pertain to any particular individual the denotation fixed is entirely generic in its character and it comes to be applied to particular individuals only through the force of such circumstances as the particular context in which the term is used, the particular person using it the particular person to whom it is addressed, the particular time and place at which it is used and so on So that when the speaker has used a general term on a particular occasion and under particular circumstances his exact meaning can be easily determined and the fact that the word has a vague generic denotation is not his fault the fault lies with the original convention that fixed that denotation and as this convention is fixed by persons other than the particular speaker who uses the word he cannot be blamed for making use of such a word blaming him for it is altogether unfair—*Tatparya*

This Casuistry is to be met by urging the necessity of the Casuist himself pointing out the peculiar circumstances favouring *his own interpretation of the ambiguous word*, for instance, the word *Navakambalah* is ambiguous—signifying 'one who has a *new* blanket' and also 'one who has *nine* blankets', under the circumstances when you take it to mean 'one who has nine blankets (and then turn to me and say that the man has only *one* blanket, and not *nine*) this is hardly fair as it is necessary to point out the peculiar circumstances that favour either of the two possible significations,—from the statement of which peculiar circumstances it would be known that the word (in the context in question) expressed that particular meaning—as a matter of fact you have no such peculiar circumstances that you could urge (in favour of your own interpretation), so that what you have brought against us is a false and futile attack *

Further, the connection of a word with its denotation is well known in the world to consist in the conventional restriction of a certain word having a certain denotation—in the form that 'of such and such a verbal expression such and such is the denotation' and this conventional restriction is found to be general (wide) in the case of general terms, and particular (specialised) in the case of particular terms and whenever these words are used they are used according to previous usage, and never in a way in which they have never been used before the use of a word again is only for the purpose of bringing about the cognition of its meaning and it is only when the meaning has been comprehended that there follows any activity (as resulting from the hearing of that word) Thus the use of words being for the sake of bringing about the comprehension of its meaning the exact usage of the general term is determined by the force (of circumstances), i.e. when such expressions are used as—'take the goat to the village' bring *butter*, 'feed the *Brāhmaṇa*'—every one of these words ('goat', butter and 'brāhmaṇa') is a general or common term and yet it is applied in actual usage to particular individuals composing what is denoted by that term and to what particular individuals it is applied is determined by the force of circumstances the term is applied to that particular

* The Puri MS reads *abhiyoga** for *nyoga*

and character), the assertion is a reference to a particular object which it is meant to eulogise, the meaning being that 'it is because the man is a Brāhmaṇa that the causes bringing about learning and character have become effective', so that when the man praises the particular object, he does not deny the operation of causes leading up to the result (that makes the object worthy of that praise). Thus it is not right to offer opposition to the assertion by assigning to it an absurd signification.

Sūtra 14

(C) A Statement being made on the basis of the secondary (figurative) denotation of words, if it is opposed by a denial of the existence of what is asserted (on the basis of their primary denotation),—this constitutes Figurative (or shifting) Casuistry. *

BHĀṢYA

By the term '*dharma*' in the Sūtra is meant that property of the word which consists in its use in accordance with its primary denotation, but sometimes [when the primary denotation is

* The meaning of the Sūtra is not quite clear the translation is in accordance with the explanation given by the *Bhāṣya*, according to the *Vārtika* (on Sū 16), the term अर्थसद्भावप्रतिबन्ध here means 'the denial of the presence of the thing' and this suggests to the mind a very much simpler interpretation of the Sūtra itself 'when the statement is made in regard to the '*धर्म*' property, of a thing, if this is opposed by the denial of the thing itself, we have the Shifting Casuistry'. This appears to be more in keeping with what follows in the next two Sūtras, and it is also supported by the *Vārtika* where it says that in the Shifting Casuistry what is denied is the object 'the thing,' *dharmin*. Though this statement, not being found to be in keeping with the interpretation of the *Bhāṣya*, has been twisted by the *Tātparyī* and the *Parisuddhi* to mean something totally different.

The explanation of the Sūtra provided by the *Nyāyasūtratīkā* is as follows 'Dharma stands for one of the two denotations of a word—primary or secondary —*tasya*, 'of that' —*anvaidhah kalpana*, 'more than one alternative meaning'—*yatra*, 'in which', *mrdeṣe*, *adyuktasābde-saṁ* s. e., 'the words used by the first party being such as admit of more than one meaning', —'*arthasadbhātēna*, *tadyukṣatātparāyā sadarthatātparāyāprayuktatākye*, *aprasa-* *rayitīya arthantarātātparākalpanāya prativedhah*,—the statement denying the existence of a thing by one denotation, if the existence of that is denied in accordance with the other denotation —it constitutes figurative casuistry.

17832
S N

meaning other than the one intended,—that is by assigning to it an entirely absurd meaning,—this opposition being in the following form—‘If learning and character are natural to the Brāhmaṇa then they should be found in the delinquent * Brāhmaṇa also, as he also is a *Brāhmaṇa*’

That word is called ‘too generic’ which, while applying to the thing desired to be spoken of, also over-reaches it, e.g. the *Brāhmaṇahood*—which is denoted by the term ‘*Brāhmaṇa*’—is sometimes found to be concomitant with learning and character and sometimes it is found to over-reach it, i.e. not concomitant with it. And as the opposition offered is based upon this ‘too generic’ character of the term used, it has been called the ‘*Generalising Casuistry*’

This Casuistry is to be met by pointing out that what the speaker (of the second sentence) means is not to propound a reason (for what the previous speaker has said with regard to a particular Brāhmaṇa being endowed with learning and character) but only to make a *reference* (i.e. a *representation* of what has been asserted in the previous sentence), as the second assertion is meant to be mere praise (of the *particular* Brāhmaṇa mentioned in the preceding sentence), so that there is no room for the assigning of the absurd signification. For instance, when one says ‘corns grow in this field’, another man may say ‘in this field even seeds do not have to be sown,’—it is certainly not meant that seeds are not to be sown in the field, and yet what is said clearly is that they are not necessary, and by this the field which is the receptacle of the growing corn is praised, so that the assertion ‘seeds do not have to be sown in this field’ is meant to be a *reference* to the particular field with a view to praise it, and though the growing of the corn depends upon the seeds, this is not what is meant to be expressed by the sentence. Similarly in the case in question, by the assertion ‘learning and character are only natural to the Brāhmaṇa’, what is meant is that the particular Brāhmaṇa possesses learning and character, and not that he possesses them *because he is a Brāhmaṇa*, what is meant to be expressed is not the *cause* (of the man’s possessing learning

* The Brāhmaṇa who has not gone through the rites and ceremonies essential for all Brahmanas is called a *śrāvya** delinquent

and character), the assertion is a reference to a particular object which it is meant to eulogise, the meaning being that 'it is because the man is a Brāhmana that the causes bringing about learning and character have become effective', so that when the man praises the particular object, he does not deny the operation of causes leading up to the result (that makes the object worthy of that praise). Thus it is not right to offer opposition to the assertion by assigning to it an absurd signification.

Sūtra 14

(C) A Statement being made on the basis of the secondary (figurative) denotation of words, if it is opposed by a denial of the existence of what is asserted (on the basis of their primary denotation).—this constitutes Figurative (or shifting) Casuistry *

BHĀṢYA

By the term *dharma* in the Sūtra is meant that property of the word which consists in its use in accordance with its primary denotation, but sometimes [when the primary denotation is

* The meaning of the Sūtra is not quite clear, the translation is in accordance with the explanation given by the *Bhāṣya* according to the *Vartika* (on Sa 16) the term अर्थसदभावप्रतिबन्ध here means 'the denial of the presence of the thing' and this suggests to the mind a very much simpler interpretation of the Sūtra itself 'when the statement is made in regard to the 'धर्म' property, of a thing, if this is opposed by the denial of the thing itself, we have the Shifting Casuistry. This appears to be more in keeping with what follows in the next two Sūtras and it is also supported by the *Vartika* where it says that in the Shifting Casuistry what is denied is the object 'the thing,' *dharmin*. Though this statement, not being found to be in keeping with the interpretation of the *Bhāṣya*, has been twisted by the *Tatparya* and the *Parisuddhi* to mean something totally different.

The explanation of the Sūtra provided by the *Nyāyasūtratrayavivaraṇa* is as follows: 'Dharma stands for one of the two denotations of a word—primary or secondary,—*tasya*, 'of that —*vivādikaḥ kṛpāḥ* more than one alternative meaning'—*yaḥ*, 'in which', *mrdeṣe*, *vadyuktasabde-saḥ* : *e* 'the words used by the first party being such as admit of more than one meaning', —*arthasūddhau ena* *adhyāśākatatratyā sadarthatatparyaprayuktavakye*, *apara* *ratyā arthantaratatparyākalpanāya pratijedhah*,—the statement declaring the existence of a thing by one denotation if the existence of that is denied in accordance with the other denotation —it constitutes figurative casuistry.

BRITISH MUSEUM
17832
S N ...

found inapplicable] this property (usage) becomes subject to option (in the shape of a second denotation), and this secondary usage consists in using a word, which has been found to have one primary denotation, in a sense different from that denotation, — and when a statement is made in accordance with this secondary denotation, we have what has been called in the *Sūtra* '*dharmatva-kalpanirdeśa*'* e.g. When the statement is made 'the platforms are shouting', (which is made on the basis of the secondary meaning of the term 'platforms', which here stands for the men on the platforms), — and it is opposed by a denial on the basis of the primary meaning [i.e. taking the word as if it had been used in its primary denotation this denial being in the form 'Certainly it is the men seated on the platforms that are shouting and not the platforms themselves

But in this case, where is the assumption of a contrary meaning' [which, according to *Sūtra* 1 2-10 is a necessary condition in all Casuistry?]

It consists in assigning to the word a meaning different from that with reference to which it has been used, i.e. the word having been used in reference to its secondary meaning the Opponent assigns to it the primary meaning — and as this Casuistry pertains to the figurative or secondary signification of words, it is called 'Figurative Casuistry'. What is meant by '*apacāra*', 'secondary or figurative denotation' is that meaning which is indicated by such causes as association and the like and we have the figurative use of a word only when there is such a meaning indicated by association &c. [so that figurative significations cannot be had recourse to at random]

This third kind of Casuistry is met in the following manner — Whenever a statement is made, a concurrence with or denial of the words used and their significations should be in accordance

* The words of the *Bhāṣya* are '*tatya nirdeśa*' when there is a statement of that i.e. of the secondary meaning but as the statement is not of the meaning the *Tātparyā* has taken the words to mean '*tava — dharmatva-kalpana — nirdeśa*' — '*tākye*' so that the meaning is when there is statement in accordance with the secondary meaning. The *Parasuddhi* remarks that all this twisting of the words of the *Bhāṣya* has been done with a view to reconcile the *Bhāṣya* to the *Īrtika*. But we fail to see much difference between the two

with the intention of the person making that statement,—and not at random, according to one's own wish * It is well known in common parlance that a word may be used either in its primary direct sense or in its secondary figurative sense and when such usage is generally accepted, if a certain word is used, the concurrence with it, or the denial of it should be in keeping with the speaker's intention, and not at random, so that when the speaker uses a term in its primary sense the concurrence with or denial of, his statement should be in reference to that sense of his words, and not in reference to any sense that the Opponent may choose to impose upon it similarly if he uses the term in its secondary sense it is this sense that should be concurred with or denied On the other hand when the speaker uses a term in its secondary sense and his Opponent denies it in reference to its primary sense,—then this denial becomes a mere arbitrary denial and it cannot be regarded as an opposition to the first party.

Sūtra 15

[An objection is raised]—

Figurative Casuistry is only verbal Casuistry : as it does not differ from it *

भट्टाश्या

[An objection is raised]—'Figurative Casuistry does not differ from Verbal Casuistry as the assigning of a different meaning (from the one intended by the speaker) is common to both For instance in the example cited—in the statement 'the platforms are shouting' the word ('platform') intended to be taken in the secondary sense of *the persons* occupying the place (on the platform) is assumed to have the primary sense of the *place* itself and the opposition offered is based upon this assumption.'

* The *Tatparya* takes छन्द to mean छद्मना, by *trick*. But the ordinary meaning of छन्द appears to be more suitable. The sense is that you should concur with or deny the statement in the form and in the sense in which it is made by the speaker, and you are not to impose your own reading or your own interpretation on it.

Sūtra 16

[Answer]—

It is not so, as there is a difference in it
BHĀṢYA

[The answer to the objection urged in the preceding Sūtra is that] Figurative Casuistry is not the same as Verbal Casuistry as in the former *the denial of the presence of the thing* constitutes a difference 'Difference from what?' From the mere assumption of a different meaning (which is found in Verbal Casuistry) as a matter of fact the 'assumption of a different meaning' is one thing and the 'total denial of the presence of the thing denoted' is something entirely different

Sūtra 17

If the two were to be regarded as non different on the ground of some kind of similarity,—there would be only one kind of Casuistry

BHĀṢYA

What the Opponent in Sūtra 15 has done is to accept the twofold division of Casuistry and to deny the third kind, this denial being on the ground of some sort of a similarity (between the third and the first kinds) But just as this reason (the presence of some sort of similarity) serves to set aside threefoldness, so ought it to set aside twofoldness also as there is some sort of similarity between these two (first and second kinds) also If the mere presence of some similarity cannot do away with the twofold division then it should not do away with the threefold division either *

SECTION 4

[Sūtras 18 20]

Defects of Reasoning due to the Incapacity of the Reasoner
INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Next to Casuistry—

Sūtra 18

Futile rejoinder is that objection which is taken on the basis of mere * similarity and dissimilarity

* The *Nyāyasūtravivaraṇa* explains that Futile Rejoinder is that which is urged on the basis of a similarity and dissimilarity only — *i.e.* irrespectively

When a certain reasoning has been put forward the objection to it that follows, takes birth (jayate)—is called 'Jāti', 'Futile Rejoinder'. This objection is in the form of opposition, an attack, a denial—on the basis of similarity and dissimilarity. That is to say, when the Probans put forward by the first party is one that is intended to prove the conclusion through its *similarity* to the Example,—and an objection is taken on the basis of its *dissimilarity* (to that Example),—or when the Probans put forward is intended to prove the conclusion through its *dissimilarity* to the Example,—and an objection is taken on the basis of its *similarity* to it,—we have what is called 'Jāti' (Futile Rejoinder), because it comes up—*is born*—as an opponent (to the original reasoning) *

Sūtra 19

It is a case of Clincher when there is misapprehension, as also when there is incomprehension †

of any idea of invariable concomitance in fact it continues similarity and dissimilarity do not enter into all cases of Futile Rejoinder as is clear from the definitions and examples provided under Adh. 5. It makes a Futile Rejoinder when no notice is taken of invariable concomitance. This is what has led the modern Logicians to define Jāti Futile Rejoinder simply as *śatā uttarom* 'wrong answer' i. e. an answer which is either incapable of shaking the opposite view or which is vitiated by self-contradictions.

The Tatparya has an interesting note. It is not always reprehensible to put forward a Futile Rejoinder. For instance when a man upholding the authority of the Veda is met by a series of arguments against its authority, and at the spur of the moment he does not find proper answers to these arguments he is fully justified in urging what is really a Futile Rejoinder if he feels that by so doing he will stave off the atheistic tendency of the audience produced by his opponent's arguments. But in other cases a Futile Rejoinder is urged only unknowingly.

* In view of the real nature of several Futile Rejoinders—which are not urged on the basis of a similarity or dissimilarity to any Example at all—the Vartika says that when the Bhasya talks of similarity or dissimilarity to the Example it is only by way of illustration. As there are several Futile Rejoinders that are urged on the basis of similarity or dissimilarity to other things also.

† The Parīśuddhi not satisfied with the Sūtra as it stands, takes it as implying the following generalised definition—When a controversy has been started any action that is indicative of either party's ignorance constitutes a Clincher. It further says that Clincher is treated of last as it puts an end to all controversy no further discussion can proceed when once one of the parties falls into a Clincher.

BHĀṢYA

Misapprehension* is that comprehension which is either wrong or reprehensible. The man who misapprehends things becomes defeated and Clincher consists in this defeat. It is a case of incomprehension when the subject being one on which something has to be said if the person does not say anything, that is for instance if he either does not oppose what has been sought to be proved by the other party or does not meet the objections that have been urged against himself.

The non-compounding (of the words *vipratipattiḥ* and *apratipattiḥ* whose compounding would have made the Sutra terser) is meant to indicate that these two are not the only Clinchers [there being several others as described in detail in Adh. V all which become implied by the use of the particle *ca*].

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

A question arises—"Example has been described as of one kind only—are Futile Rejoinder and Clincher also each of one kind only? Or are these of diverse kinds like Doctrine?"

The answer to this is provided in the following Sutra—

Sutra 20

There is a Multiplicity of Futile Rejoinders and Clinchers, owing to there being several and diverse varieties of both.

As Objection taken on the basis of similarity and dissimilarity can be of several diverse kinds—there must be several varieties of Futile Rejoinder. Similarly as misapprehension and incomprehension are of several diverse kinds—there must be several varieties of Clincher also. The term *ekalpa* stands for several varieties or diverse varieties. As examples of the diversity of Clinchers (defined in Su. 5.2.1—24)—the Clinchers of *Ananyabhāṣana*, *Ajūḥna*, *Apratibha*, *Viksepa*, *Matanujna* and *Paryanuyogopakeśana* are indicative of incomprehension while the rest are indicative of misapprehension.

Thus have *Pramāṇa* and other categories been (a) mentioned (in Su. 1.1.1) and (b) defined in the order of their mention and they will (in the next four Adhyāyas) be (c) examined in accordance with their definitions. Thus is the threefold function of the Scientific Treatise to be regarded as duly fulfilled.

Thus ends the first Adhyāya of Vatsyayana's *Bhāṣya* on the *Nyāya-Sūtra*.

* A misapprehension is called simply wrong when the subject-matter is something too subtle to be grasped by an ordinary intellect. It is called reprehensible when it pertains to something gross, an ordinary thing quite within the range of ordinary minds.—*Tatparya*.

ADHYĀYA II

Daily Lesson I

SECTION 1

Detailed Examination of Doubt

[Sūtras 1—7]

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

After this proceeds the *detailed examination of Pramāṇa* and the other categories. And inasmuch as every definitive cognition has been declared (in Sūtra 1 1 41) to consist in the 'ascertainment of the real character of a thing after duly *deliberating* over the two sides of the question' (whereby *deliberation* or *Doubt* is made the precursor of all Definite Cognition)—it is Doubt that is examined first of all.*

Sūtra 1

No Doubt can arise either from the certain cognition of properties common to several objects or from the certain cognition of characters belonging to only one of the objects.†

(a) "As a matter of fact Doubt arises from the cognition of common properties and not from the properties only‡ —(b) or

* The *Vārtika* gives further reasons for beginning the *detailed examination* with Doubt even though the enunciation has begun with *Pramāṇa*.

† Sūtras 1 to 5 embody the *Purvapakṣa* view which traverses the explanation of Doubt provided in Sū 1 1 23.

‡ This opening sentence of the *Bhāṣya* is a little obscure. The words of the *Sūtra* apparently mean that Doubt does not arise from the cognition of common properties while the *Bhāṣya* represents the sense to be that 'Doubt arises from the cognition of common properties. The explanation given in the Footnote (in the *Vedāntaśāstra* Series Edition) is in itself a forced one but it would be acceptable if it did not make this opening sentence identical in sense with what follows as the fourth alternative explanation provided by the *Bhāṣya* below. Both the *Vārtika* and the *Tatparyā* have felt this difficulty. The former characterises this first statement of the *Purvapakṣa* as *Yathārūṭi utthanam* and the latter remarks that the statement is made regardless of the explanations that have been provided under Sū 1 1 23. The real explanation is as follows as is made clear in the *Bhāṣyacandra*.

The present Sū. 1 contains three statements—I समानधर्माध्यवसायात् न संशयः (this denies the first statement in Sū 1 1 23) २३३ समानधर्मापत्ते

again, as a matter of fact, we do not find any Doubt arising from the mere cognition of the property and the things possessing that property,—i.e. no Doubt is found to arise at the time that the observer has the idea 'I perceive a property common to these two things'*,—(c) or it is not possible for any Doubt to arise from the cognition of common properties when the thing (in regard to which the common properties are perceived) is different, e.g. when the cognition of common properties appears in regard to one thing for instance *Colour*, the Doubt cannot arise in regard to another thing, for instance *Touch*,—(d) or lastly, from *Adhyavāsya*,—which stands for conviction certain cognition—there cannot arise Doubt, which stands for uncertain cognition, as in this case there would be no affinity between Cause and Effect (which is essential)

"These same objections apply also to the view that Doubt arises *anekadharmādhyavāsyaḥ*, i.e. from the conviction of the properties of several things

"Nor does Doubt ever arise from the cognition of the properties of any one out of two things, on the contrary, from such cognition there arises the certain cognition of that one thing"†

मशय) this is interpreted by the Bhā as representing the four *pūrtapakṣas*—(a) taking उपपत्ति of Sū 1 1 23 to mean mere presence or connection and denying that mere presence of common properties gives rise to Doubt which only arises when these properties are duly recognised (b) taking उपपत्ति to mean cognition and denying that any doubt can arise even from the recognition of common properties in only one of the two things that enter into the doubt (c) taking उपपत्ति = definite ascertainment and (d) stating the objection in a different manner from (c) II अनेकधर्माप्यवसायात् न मशय (this denies the अनेकधर्मोपपत्ति of Sū 1 1 23) which contains the same term उपपत्ति is open to all the four *pūrtapakṣas* that have been urged above III अन्यतरधर्माप्यवसायात् न मशय

* Thus thing (which is seen) and that thing (which is remembered) इमं विशेषेण पश्यन् इमं च विशेषेण स्मरेन् कथं मशयीत—says *Bhāṣyaśāstra*

† This alternative takes *aneka* as equivalent to *anyatara* one of the two similar things

Sūtra 2

(f) "Nor from the cognition of diversity of opinions or from that of uncertainty "

(1) "Doubt does not arise either from 'diversity of opinions' only, or from 'uncertainty' only, in fact Doubt appears in a man who knows of the 'diversity of opinions'—similarly it appears in one who is cognisant of the uncertainty " * (2) Or, how could any Doubt arise from the certain cognition of the fact that 'some people think that the Soul exists, while others think that it does not exist ' ? Similarly, † in regard to the 'uncertainty of perception' (which has been held in Su 1-1 23, to be a cause of Doubt) What happens in the case of *uncertainty* is that the observer duly recognises that there can be no certainty as to the thing being *perceived* (actually cognised as possessed of a certain character) and also that there is no certainty as to its being *not perceived* (actually cognised as *not* possessing a certain character) and when each of these facts is duly cognised there can be no Doubt §'

Sūtra 3

(g) " Also because in a case of Diversity of opinions there is certainty of conviction.

' That which you regard to be a case of 'diversity of opinions' is a case of *certain conviction*, it represents the certain conviction of two persons in regard to two opposite ideas [one man being *certain of the existence of the Soul* while the other is *certain of its*

* The *Bhāṣya* says that this *Purvapakṣa* emanates from one who does not rightly comprehend the meanings of the two terms *vipratipatti* and '*atyaśiṅhā*' as contained in Sū 1 1 23 and hence denies the fact of Doubt proceeding from these

And here also in the *Bhāṣya* the statement of the *Purvapakṣa* (1) proceeds on the basis of the term *upapatti* being taken to signify mere *presence*, while that in (2) is based upon '*upapatti*' signifying *cognition*

† *तथा* gives better sense—and is found in the *Puti* Mss as also in three other Mss

§ The *Bhāṣya* interprets *upalabdhi* as the means of cognising a thing as possessing a character and *anupalabdhi* as a means of cognising it as not possessing it So that in cases of uncertainty all that the observer feels is that there is neither any proof nor disproof of a certain fact, and what this means is that the man will have no idea at all and not that he will have a *doubt*

non existence, each man having a firm conviction in regard to his own opinion, which is contrary to the opinion of another person | So that if Doubt arose from 'diversity of opinions, it would arise also from 'certain conviction' (which is absurd)

Sūtra 4

(h) " Further, because uncertainty itself is quite certain in its uncertain character [no Doubt can arise from it] "

No Doubt can arise—this has to be added to the Sūtra. The meaning is this —If the *Uncertainty* (that has been held to be the cause of Doubt) is, in itself, quite *certain*, then, inasmuch as there is *certainly*—it would not be a case of *Uncertainty* at all, so that there should be no Doubt possible. If on the other hand the *Uncertainty* is not quite certain in its own character, this would mean that it is not a real *Uncertainty* at all, being not certain in its uncertain character, and in this case also no Doubt should arise

Sūtra 5

(f) ' Lastly, Doubt would never cease, inasmuch as the property (whose cognition gives rise to the Doubt) continues to exist '

BHĀṢYA

" You hold that Doubt arises from the cognition of a common property, now on this theory Doubt should be absolutely persistent. * for inasmuch as the cognition of the common property (which is the cause) does not cease to exist, there should be no cessation of the Doubt (which is the effect) As a matter of fact, even while one is pondering over a certain thing (the Post for instance), this thing does not cease to be known as possessing the (common) property (*Tallness* for instance, whose perception may have given rise to Doubt), in fact it always retains that property [so that when the cause is there the effect, in the shape of the Doubt, must be there also] "

* I E It should continue even when the distinguishing feature of any one thing would be clearly perceived

erty) it is implied that there is cognition of the common property from which cognition the Doubt arises *

As a matter of fact however, the *Pūrvapakṣa* argument is set aside by the presence of the term '*apapatti*' itself in the Sū (1-1-23) What the Sūtra says is that Doubt arises from the '*apapatti*' of the common property, and there can be no *apapatti* of a thing apart from the cognition of its existence, for a common property whose existence is not cognised would be as good as non-existent

Then again [even granting that the term '*apapatti*' denotes mere presence, and not cognition of existence] a term that expresses an object also generally denotes the cognition of that object, e.g. when in ordinary parlance people say, 'fire is inferred from smoke' what this assertion is understood to mean is that 'Fire is inferred from the perception of smoke' and why is it so? Simply because the man makes the inference when he perceives the smoke, and not while he does not perceive it, and yet in the said assertion, we do not find the term 'perception' though everyone admits that that is what the assertion means, from which it is clear that the person who hears and understands the said assertion admits that a term expressing the object also denotes the cognition of that object. Similarly in the case in question the term common property may be taken to denote the cognition of the common property

(b) It has been urged in the *Pūrvapakṣa Bhāṣya*, that—"No doubt is found to arise at the time that the observer has the idea 'I perceive a property common to these two things', wherein there is an apprehension of the property and the things possessing it"—But what is here asserted refers to what is perceived before (the appearance of Doubt)—the idea present in the observer's mind (at the time that Doubt appears) being in the following form—"I am perceiving now a property that is common to two things known to me (perceived by me before),—and I am not perceiving any property that belongs to any one of them specifically,—how may I find some such specific property

* This answer to the *Pūrvapakṣa* proceeds on the admission that the word '*apapatti*' in Sū 1-1-23 means presence—the meaning assigned to the term by the *Pūrvapakṣin*. The real answer, however, is that the term '*apapatti*' itself means cognition, and this answer follows in the next sentence

whereby I may be certain as to one or the other?' And certainly a Doubt in this form does not cease merely on the perception of a common property bringing to the mind that property and the thing possessing that property

(c) Thirdly, it has been urged that—"Doubt with regard to one thing cannot arise from the certain conviction with regard to another"—This could be rightly urged only against one who holds the view that mere certain conviction with regard to one thing is the cause of Doubt [and we do not hold any such view] *

(d) Fourthly it has been urged that—'(From the certain cognition of common property Doubt cannot arise), as in this case there would not be that affinity between cause and effect (which is essential) † —But what constitutes the 'affinity between cause and effect is only the fact that the presence and absence of the effect are in accordance with the presence and absence of the cause, and further, when between two things it is found that if one comes into existence the other also comes into existence, and if the former does not come to existence the latter also does not come into existence,—then the former is called the 'cause' and the latter the 'effect' this is what constitutes another affinity or 'homogeneity' (between cause and effect), § and certainly there is this 'affinity' between Doubt and its cause (the Perception of Common Property) ‡

* Our view being that Doubt arises regarding a thing with specific properties when what is perceived is only a thing as possessing properties common to more than one thing — *Bhāṣyatandra*

† The certain cognition of common property apprehends the presence of such property while Doubt apprehends the absence of such property, and no affinity is possible between two such heterogeneous cognitions — this is the meaning of the *Purāṇapāṇa-Bhāṣyatandra*

§ According to the *Bhāṣyatandra*, there are two *affinities* pointed out here as expressed in the translation. It may however be simpler to take the second as only explanatory of the first the only affinity consisting in the fact that the presence and absence of the one are in accordance (simultaneous) with the presence and absence of the other that is to say 'the affinity consists in the fact that when one comes into existence, the other also does the same &c &c

‡ The *Īrīka* does not accept this view of 'affinity' according to it the homogeneity between Doubt and its cause in the shape of the Cognition of common property consists in the fact that in both the Cognition of specific properties is wanting. The *Tātparyā* adds that according to the view expressed in the *Bhāṣya* the case of all *eternal* causes would be excluded, as they never come into existence and cease to exist

(e) The above reasoning also serves to answer the *Purvapakṣa* argument that no Doubt can arise from the cognition of the property of several things.

(f) It has been urged by the *Purvapakṣin* (under Su 2) that—'No Doubt can arise from the Cognition of either diverse opinions or uncertainty'—Our answer to this is that (as regards the case of *Diverse opinions*) when the Doubt appears the idea present in the observer's mind is as follows—'From two contradictory statements I find the thing to be possessed of contradictory properties,—and I do not know of any specific circumstance attending it,—nor do I perceive any such property whereby I could be certain with regard to one or the other of the two properties,—what specific circumstance could there be, whereby I could become certain with regard to one or the other?'—And such being the well-known form of the Doubt brought about by the *Diversity of Opinions* (as helped by the non cognition of special conditions), it cannot be rejected simply by reason of the comprehension (by the third party) of the diversity of opinions *

The same holds good also with regard to what has been urged against Doubt arising from the 'uncertainty in regard to Perception and Non perception' † [In this case also the particular form in which the Doubt appears makes it clear that it arises from the cognition of uncertainty as helped by the non cognition of special circumstances And this Doubt also cannot be rejected merely by reason of the cognition of uncertainty]

(g) It has been urged (in Su 3) that—'Because there is certainty of conviction in the case of Diversity of opinions (no Doubt can arise from this latter)'—Now what is held to be the

* विप्रतिपात्तसम्यक् of the Fir Edn. gives no sense. The Purv MS. reads विप्रतिपात्तसम्यक्पात्त. The meaning is that the presence of Doubt in the mind of the observer, the third party is not incompatible with his comprehension of the fact that these two persons hold two different opinions on this point.

† Perception here stands for proof in support and non perception for 'proof against' there is 'uncertainty in regarding these when the observer does not affirm either statement'—certainty gives rise to Doubt—*Bhāṣyatandra*

cause of Doubt is the Cognition of that which is denoted by the term 'Diversity of opinions,' this Cognition being wanting in the conception of any specific character (favouring any one of the opinions), and certainly it is not fair to discard the view merely by thrusting a different name (to what is meant by 'diverse opinions'), that is to say, the term 'diverse opinions' stands for *contradictory assertions with regard to one and the same thing* what gives rise to Doubt is the Cognition (by the third party, the enquirer) of such assertions, as helped by the non-cognition of any special circumstances (in favour of one or the other) and it cannot cease to give rise to doubt merely by your giving to it a different name, so that this argument of the Purīpākṣin can only delude the ignorant *

(h) It has been urged (under Su 4) that— Because uncertainty itself is quite certain in its uncertain character (it can not give rise to Doubt) "—Well, in arguing thus it is admitted that there is such a thing as the 'Cause of Doubt, and also that it is of the nature of 'uncertainty essentially all that is done is to give it a different name certainty (without denying the thing itself)—and this name can apply to the said thing only in a sense different from its natural signification [i.e. *Uncertainty* can be called 'certainty only in the sense of *fixity definiteness* and not in the sense of *freedom from doubt*], and this assumption of a different name also is absolutely futile for a *certainty* can never be 'uncertainty, being as it is *fixed* in its own (certain) character. So that the assertion made by the Opponent does not deny the fact that Doubt is produced by the fact of perception and non-perception pertaining to both existence and non-existence (of the thing with regard to which the Doubt arises) as accompanied by the fact of a specific circumstance in favour of either not being available,—and in so far as the said *uncertainty* is fixed in its *uncertain* character it does not lose its own character hence the 'uncertainty' is admitted by (the Opponent's own assertion) — Thus it is found that even though a different name is assumed, it

* It is true that the individual upholder of each of the diverse opinions has a certain conviction on the point, there is however no such conviction in the mind of the third party, who only hears these opinions expressed and cannot find any special circumstances in favour of either

does not prove anything different (from the conclusion to which exception is meant to be taken)

(i) It has also been urged (in Su 5) that— Doubt would never cease, as the property continues to persist"—But as a matter of fact Doubt is produced, *not* merely by the *common property* etc (whose persistence would make the Doubt persistent), but by the *cognition of the common property*, as accompanied by a *remembrance of the specific characters*, (as shown under Su. 1 1 23), so that there is no possibility of the Doubt being unceasingly persistent

(j) Lastly, it has been urged by the *Purvapakṣin* that— 'Doubt never arises from the cognition of the properties of any one out of two things'—This objection is not well taken, for it has been distinctly stated (in Su 1-1-23) that Doubt is that *wavering judgment which is wanting in the cognition of the specific character of a thing*, and as the 'specific character' can only consist in the 'property of one out of two things', when there is a cognition of *such* property, there can be no 'wanting in the cognition of the specific character' [and as such it would not be a Doubt at all]

Sūtra 7

Wherever there is Doubt, there is possibility of the aforesaid questions and answers

BHĀṢYA

Wherever the Investigation carried on is preceded by Doubt—either in a scientific Treatise or in a Controversy—the Opponent will try to deny the very existence of the Doubt (in the manner of the above *Purvapakṣa*), and in that case he should be met with the answer (detailed above) * It is for this reason that as pertaining to all Investigations, *Doubt* has been examined first of all †

* The *Nyāyasūtratrayataraṇa* remarks that this advice applies to the case of the examination of every one of the sixteen categories—the examination of *Pramāṇa* also is preceded by the doubt as to whether there are 2 or 3 or 4 *Pramāṇas* and so forth in regard to every one of such Doubts the *Purvapakṣin* may try to deny the very existence of Doubt and then he is to be met in the manner explained here

† The *Parīśuddhi* offers another interesting explanation of this Sūtra () It takes it to be a sort of an explanation provided for the Sūtra undertaking

SECTION (2)

Detailed Examination of Pramānas in General

Sūtras 8-20

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Next follows the detailed *Examination of Pramāna* *—

to enter into a thorough *examination* of *Pramanas* and a few other categories only, and omitting such others as *Prayojana* and the like. The Sūtra is taken to mean that a thorough *examination* is called for only in regard to matters in regard whereunto there are doubts. As a matter of fact the nature of *Prayojana* and the other categories, whose *examination* has been omitted is fully known to all—from the learned philosopher down to the mere cowherdess, so that no thorough examination is necessary in their case. Then again the method of examination employed in regard to *Pramana* &c may be applied to these other categories also: this is what the *seventh* Sūtra means— Whenever there is any doubt in regard to any category we should employ the method of examination which consists of questions and answers.

The *Bhāṣyacandra* remarks as follows— 'The Sūtra is meant to be an advice to the Pupil to the effect that it is not right to deny the existence of Doubt as a preliminary accessory of all Discussion: the sense being that inasmuch as Doubt is such an accessory whenever any Discussion is started one should not meet it with the preliminary objection that the very Doubt on which the Discussion proceeds is not possible: the right course is to supply answers to the questions raised. This advice being summed up in three verses — 'The dull ignoramus and the man who has reached the highest pinnacle of wisdom: these two persons are happy persons falling between these two extremes always suffer (1) —The man whose mind is in doubt is beset with difficulties at each step: freedom from Doubt represents highest bliss: this being the form of the Supreme Self (2) —For these reasons: you should listen to all theories: and then having raised questions in regard to the e, you should enter into the discussion with qualified persons and thereby ascertain the truth (3)

* In the case of Doubt, it was necessary to alter the order in which the categories had been mentioned in Sūtra 1-1-1, because Doubt forms the starting point of all investigations. Among the rest of the categories there is no reason for dealing with any of them out of its proper place, so the Author now takes up the examination of *Pramāna*. There again he begins with the examination of the character of *Pramana* in general before proceeding with the particular *Pramāṇas*. The *Pramāna* in general, may be defined as the Instrument of Cognition, and these instruments are Perception and the rest — *Tātparyā*

Sūtra 8

" Perception and the rest cannot be regarded as Instruments of Cognition, on account of the impossibility of connecting them with any of the three points of time —"

" The character of Instrument of Cognition cannot belong to Perception &c, as it is impossible to connect them with any of the three points of time that is to say it is not possible for them either to precede or to synchronise with or to follow (the objects cognised) †

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

What has been stated above in a general way is next explained in detail (by the *Purvapakṣin*)—

Sūtra 9

If the *Pramāṇa* exists already before (the Object) then perception cannot be produced by the contact of the sense organ with the object —

Perception is the Cognition of such objects as Odour and the rest if this Perception (*Pramāṇa*) exists already and Odour

* The Sūtra denies the very existence of *Pramāṇas* on the ground that they do not prove the existence of these objects at any point of time — *Bhāṣyaendra*

† The *Tatparya* thus sums up the *Purvapakṣa* embodied in Sūtras 8-11 — This *Purvapakṣa* emanates from the *Mādhyamika* Buddha and may be explained as follows — Though our firm conviction is that nothing in the world can bear any investigation — so that so far as we ourselves are concerned *Pramāṇas* also as a subject that cannot bear any examination — yet we proceed to show that *Pramāṇas* as accepted by other people are untenable and this we shall show on the basis of those same *Pramāṇas* that are held by those same people and thus it is a fault of the *Pramāṇas* themselves that they melt away by their own inner contradictions. The argument against *Pramāṇa* may be thus formally stated—Perception and the rest cannot be regarded as *Pramāṇa* because they cannot prove or indicate the presence of their objects at any point of time. Anviti that does not prove its object at any time is not regarded as *Pramāṇa* for instance the conception of Hare's Horns — Perception &c are such therefore they cannot be regarded as *Pramāṇa*.

It is interesting to compare this statement of the *Mādhyamika* view with the *Vedānta* view expressed in *Akhaṇḍanābhāṣya* Trans Vol I Para 9

&c, come into existence *after* it, then the Perception cannot be said to be produced by the contact (with the sense organ) of those things, Odour, &c **

Sūtra 10

' If the Pramāna comes into existence after (the Object), then the existence of the Object of Cognition cannot be dependent upon Pramānas †—

" While the Pramāna does not exist, by whose instrumentality would the thing be cognised and thereby become the object of cognition ? It is only when a thing is cognised by the instrumentality of Pramānas that it comes to be known as '*prameya*' object of cognition "

Sūtra 11

" If the two come into existence simultaneously, then, inasmuch as each cognition is restricted to its own object, there can be no sequence among cognitions " §

BHĀṢYA

' If it be held that the *Pramāna* and its *Object* both come into existence at the same time,—then, inasmuch as all cognitions pertain to their own particular object, it would be possible for them to come into existence at the same time, and therefore, *inasmuch as each cognition is restricted to its own object, there can be no necessity of sequence among cognitions*. As a matter of fact, all these cognitions are found to appear with regard to their objects, one after the other, but this sequence would not be necessary (if the cognition and its object were to appear at the same time) And further [even if such sequence be not considered essential] this simultaneity of cognitions would contradict

* I F 'The Substance can have no connection with the operation (which is absurd)—says the *Bhāṣyatandra*

† The meaning of the Sūtra is as follows. As a matter of fact, Pramāna is an Instrument and the Instrument is a particular kind of substance accompanied by a certain action or operation, neither the operation alone nor the substance alone can be called 'Instrument', if then, this substance along with the operation of bringing about the cognition, is already there, before the Object has come into existence,—then the said cognition cannot be regarded as brought about by contact with that object —*Bhāṣyatandra*

§ 'Cognition' in this Sūtra stands for '*Pramāna*', which as explained before, stands for the means of cognition, and also the cognition itself

what has been declared (under Sū. 1-1-16) to the effect that 'the presence of the Mind is indicated by the non simultaneity of cognitions' "

"The aforesaid are the only three possible alternatives in regard to the existence (or relation) of *Pramāṇa* and its *Object*, and every one of them has been found to be untenable, so the conclusion is that Perception and the rest cannot be regarded as '*Pramāṇa*' "

The answer to the above is as follows —

* *As a matter of fact between what is called the 'cause or instrument of apprehension' and what the 'object of apprehension',—there being no restriction as to the former coming into existence either before, or after, or simultaneously with the latter, we take each case on its own merits, just as we find it, and assert accordingly (either precedence or sequence or simultaneity of the one or the other)* That is to say, in some cases the Cause of Apprehension appears first, and then its object, e.g. in the case of the apprehension of things coming into existence while the Sun is shining [in which case the sunlight, which is the cause of the perception is already there, when the things are coming into existence] — in other cases the Object appears before and the Cause of its apprehension afterwards, e.g. when the lamp (just lighted) illumines and makes perceptible things already in existence,—in other cases again the Cause of apprehension and its Object come into existence together, e.g. when the apprehension of fire is brought about by means of smoke † Now '*Pramāṇa*' is the name of the *cause of apprehension*, and '*Prameya*' that of the *Object of apprehension*, so that (as shown above) there being no restriction as to exact precedence or sequence or simultaneity between the two, we have to take each case just as we find it § So that there

* The Viz Edition prints this and some other passages in thicker type —see in this connect on our note on Sū. 15 below The whole of the italicised portion occurs as a *Sūtra* in the सूत्रपाठ attached to Pur. Aṅ. B The *Bhāṣyatandā* also appears to regard this first passage as a *Sūtra*

† The apprehension of fire synchronises with the apprehension of smoke

§ Such is the sense of the *Sūtra* —says the *Bhāṣyatandā* and from this it appears that the passage containing the term *śiṣhagatatanam* constitutes a *Sūtra*

is no ground for the entire denial (of Pramānas) (which you have put forward); specially in view of the fact that you yourself admit the (efficiency of) *Pramānas* in general (in the shape e. g. of your own words) and then go on to deny the efficiency of all *Pramānas* without exception *

† Secondly, as the grounds on which the names ('*Pramāna*' and '*Prameya*') are based pertain to all three points of time, the name also should be accepted as such. That is to say, it has been urged (in Su 10) that—"if the *Pramāna* be held to come into existence after the *Prameya*, then, at the time that the *Pramāna* is non-existent, (i.e. not actually bringing about the apprehension at that time) the object could not be called '*Prameya*', as it is only when an object is actually apprehended at the time by means of

* The reading खलु विभज्य is difficult to construe. What the *Purvapakṣin* has done is to take no account of the particular facts of each case and has roundly denied the efficiency of all *Pramānas* promiscuously so that the correct word would appear to be अभिभज्य. The mistake may be due to the misreading of खलु for खल्व; लु and ल्व being very nearly alike in Maithili and Bengali scripts. But the *Bhāṣya* accepts the reading खलु विभज्य and supplies a reasonable explanation. It remarks that the passage points out an inconsistency (vśaghata) on the part of the *Purvapakṣin*. He denies all *Pramānas* but certainly accepts his own word embodying this denial as a very valid *Pramāna*.

† The italicised portion occurs as Sūtra in the सूत्रपाठ attached to Pūrva MS B. The *Bhāṣya* remarks—This refers to the following argument of the opponent—'There are four kinds of basis for the application of verbal names, these being—(1) the presence of *Genus* i.e. this is a '*Cow*', 'this is a *Brahmana*' &c. (2) Presence of *Quality*, the cow is *white*, the *Brahmana* is *patient*. (3) Presence of certain things, the *Brahmana* *has a stick* and (4) Presence of action, 'this is a *doer*', 'this a *cogniser*' and so forth. So that the name '*Pramāna*' also must have for its basis the actual *presence* of the *action of apprehension* at the same time, and it is therefore not right to say 'the *Prameya* is apprehended by the *Cogniser*, by means of the *Pramāna*'—The answer to this, given in the *Bhāṣya* is that the application of the name is not based upon the actual *presence of the action at the time*, it is based upon the *potentiality* of the thing to bring about the action, e.g. we speak of the '*cook*' though he is only *going to do the cooking*, or we say 'the *cook* is *bathing*', where even though the *action* present is that of *bathing*, yet the name applied to the man is '*Cook*'. This '*potentiality*' consists in the mere form of the thing concerned as aided by the necessary accessories.

account of the impossibility of connecting them with any of the three points of time'—apparently denies all 'Pramāna' entirely — the person making such an assertion should be asked—what do you mean to accomplish by this denial? Do you mean to set aside the possibility or very form (of the Pramānas Perception, &c) Or to make known their impossibility or absence of any form If the former, then the possibility or form of the Pramānas is admitted (as it is only what exists that can be set aside) —and the possibility or form being there Perception and the other Pramānas cannot be denied entirely If on the other hand the denial is meant to make known their impossibility, then the denial itself becomes endowed with the character of *Pramāna* (Instrument of Cognition being that which makes known things) * as the denial becomes the cause or instrument of the Cognition of the impossibility of Pramānas

[Even knowing this inconsistency the Opponent asks]—What then? —[The answer comes in the next Sūtra]

Sūtra 12

There can be no Denial as it is impossible to connect it with any of the three points of time

BHĀṢYA

[The Opponent having asked— What is the harm if the Denial becomes endowed with the character of Pramāna? —the answer is given by the Sūtra]—The detailed explanation here is the same (as in the Purvapaksa-Sūtra 8) (i.e. inasmuch as the Denial has become a Pramāna it becomes open to the arguments that the Purvapaksin has urged against the possibility of Pramānas so that] if the Denial [which *ex hypothesi* is only an instrument of right negative cognition] exists before the thing Denied then what would be there that would be denied while the thing denied (i.e. the object of the negative cognition) is not in existence? On the other hand if the Denial came after the thing Denied then while the Denial is not in existence the thing could not be 'denied' Lastly, if both the Denial and the Denied came into

* लक्षण प्राप्त, the reading of all MSS save one gives better sense than लक्षणप्राप्त

existence simultaneously, then as the thing will have been already recognised as 'denied', the Denial would be absolutely futile

Thus then, the assertion (of the *Purvapakṣin*) embodying, as it does, a *Denial*, being (as just shown) found to be impossible — it becomes established that Perception and the rest are genuine *Pramānas*

Sūtra 13

Because all *Pramānas* have been denied, the Denial itself cannot be established *

BHĀṢYA

"Why (can the Denial not be established)?" — asks the *Purvapakṣin* [For the following reason, we reply] — You have put forward (in Su 8) as your reason, 'because it cannot be connected with any of the three points of time', now if in support of this reason you can cite an Instance, then it behoves you to show (on the strength of perceptual or other valid cognition) that what you have put forward as your Reason (i.e. your Minor Premiss) does hold true in the case that you cite as the corroborative Instance, and if you do this you cannot deny the character of *Pramāna* (Proof) in regard to all Perception and the rest [as at last one such Perception you will have employed to prove the truth of your Reason] And if Perception and the rest were absolutely no proof, then what you would cite as an Instance would also not prove anything [as that also would only be a perceptual or other valid cognition], so that your reason, in that case, would be nullified by all *Pramānas*, and, as such cease to be a proper Reason, in fact, such a Reason would be a "contradictory Reason", — that has been defined as the 'contradictory Reason or Probas' which contradicts a certain doctrine that has been previously admitted' (Su 1 2 6) and what is put forward by the opponent in the assertion made by him constitutes his 'doctrine

* Later Commentators: — for instance the *Prm* of Viśvanātha and the *Nyāyaprastāraṇa* — do not have this as a *Sūtra*. The *Nyāyasambandhā* however cites it as a *Sūtra* and so also the *Bhāṣyacandra* which remarks that this *Sūtra* puts forward another self contradiction involved in the *Purvapakṣa* stand point

† According to the *Bhāṣyacandra* this 'Katham' is an attack on the opponent — How can you reasonably deny all *Pramānas*?

and this assertion is that 'Perception and the rest do not prove the existence of anything', and yet the several reasoning factors [the Premisses etc., which represent Pramānas] have been put forward (in the reasoning urged in Sū 8) with a view to prove (i.e. make known to others) your own conclusions.*

If, on the other hand, the Instance (corroborative of the Reason put forward in support of the Denial of Pramānas) is not cited (as representing a *valid cognition, pramāna*) then you are faced by the difficulty that until you have shown the truth of your Reason, or Minor Premiss, in a certain well known Instance, your assertion cannot prove your conclusion for you, so that the Denial of the Pramānas cannot be established, for the simple reason that the reason or premiss put forward does not possess the character of a really valid 'Reason'

Sūtra 14

If the character of Pramāna in the case of the reasoning-factors is admitted,—then your Denial becomes restricted to only a few from among all Pramānas, [which would not be right] †

BHĀṢYA

If you admit that the character of Pramāna really belongs§ to these *Perception and the rest* that are embodied in the reason-

* The statement of the Probans which is the principal reasoning-factor embodies facts ordinarily perceived—e.g. because Perception &c, cannot be connected with any point of time represents a number of facts perceived in ordinary experience. Now the Proposition is that 'Perception &c, do not prove anything' and yet the said Perception—that the Perception, &c, cannot be connected with any point of time—has been urged with a view to prove the conclusion. Thus the Reason, as put forward, is entirely a contravention of the Proposition.

The *Vartika* in quoting this passage reads प्रमाणानाम् for अवयवानाम् and the *Tatparya* explains प्रमाणानाम् as referring to the *Atayatas*. The *Bhāṣyatandra* reads अवयवानाम्. The sense remains the same.

† It appears simpler to interpret the Sūtra as—'the Denial does not apply to all Pramānas'. But the *Bhāṣya* has made capital out of the prefix वि in विप्रतिषेध, in view of which the translation has had to be put in a roundabout fashion, though the sense remains the same.

§ The reading of the Viz edition नामप्रामाण्ये is wrong. Both Pura Mss. read ना प्रामाण्ये, which is the right reading.

ing factors or premises involved in your negative argument (against Pramāṇas, in Su 8),—then you will have to accept the 'character of Pramāṇa' also in those *Perception and the rest* that would be embodied in the reasoning factors that might be urged (against you) by your Opponent, as there would be no difference between the two sets of 'premises'. And this would mean that you do not deny all Pramāṇas (but only some of them, for which restricted denial there can be no justification). In the term '*vipratishedha*' (in the Sūtra) the prefix '*vi*' signifies affirmation ('*vipratishedha*' meaning '*viśeṣena pratisedha*', denial by selection) and not negation (*vipratishedha* in that case being construed as *vigataḥ pratisedhaḥ*—negatived denial) * as there can be no sense in such an expression †

Sūtra 15

There should be no denial (of Pramāṇas and Prameyas) in regard to all three points of time, § as their existence (as cause and effect) is proved in the same manner as that of the musical instrument is proved by its sound

BHĀṢYA

[An objection is raised at the very outset]—'Why should this be repeated (in the Sūtra) when it has already been stated before, in the *Bhāṣya*?' †

* If *vi* signified denial then *vipratishedha* would mean denial of the denial, Denial being the object of Denial and this would be absurd as coming from the *Purvapakṣin*. For purposes of denial one always uses the term *na*—says the *Bhāṣyacandra*

† For in that case the expression in the Sūtra—*na vipratishedha* would mean that the denial is not negatived which would be the reverse of what is intended by the *Siddhāntin*—*Bhāṣyacandra*

§ That is it is quite possible for Pramāṇa and Prameya to be related to each other as 'cause and effect' and also as 'means of Cognition' and 'object of cognition'—*Bhāṣyacandra*

‡ From what we read here, there appears to be a confusion in regard to the exact position of the Sūtra and portions of the *Bhāṣya*. It has been remarked by several writers that the *Bhāṣya* contains certain passages which form part of an older *Vṛtti* on the Sūtras. The editor of the Vizianagram set es has made an attempt to indicate some of these passages by printing them in thicker type. The wider aspect of this question shall be dealt with in a suitable place. But in connection with the present

The answer is that this serves to confirm what has been said before. That is to say, we have stated above (Bha 2 1 11) that—*between the cause of apprehension and the object of apprehension there is no restriction as to the former coming into existence either before or after or simultaneously with the latter and we take each case on its own merits just as we find it and assert accordingly*—and the present Sūtra serves to show that this assertion of ours had its source in this Sūtra. [By the presence of this Sūtra] it is made clear that the Sage (Gautama) himself does not admit of any restriction (as to priority &c. between the *Pramāna* and its *Prameya*), and hence firmly rejects the opponents' denial—by asserting that 'the denial in regard to all three points of time is not right

Out of the three possibilities (of priority posteriority and simultaneity) the Sūtra cites the example of one—*In the same manner as that of the musical instrument is proved by its sound*. In the case cited we find that by means of the Sound which comes into existence after the musical instrument we infer the existence of the musical instrument which has been in existence prior to the Sound and here the musical instrument is what is to be made known, and the Sound is the means by which it is made known [and here the *Pramāna* is posterior to the *Prameya*]—this refers to a case where the musical instrument being hidden from view its presence is inferred and the inference is that the lute is being played, or the flute is being blown—the particular instrument being inferred by the peculiarity of the Sound. Thus

passage, the following appears to be noteworthy.—The objector asks why this Sūtra should be here when what is herein said has already been said before. This question would imply that the two assertions—Bh 15 and the Bhāṣya passage on Bh 2 1 11—stood on the same level being the work of the same writer. This also would appear to be the implication of what follows in the Bhāṣya on the present Sūtra. But the answer that the Bhāṣya gives to the objector's question is that the former statement has its source or authority in the present Sūtra—that is why the fact previously asserted is asserted again. Now what does this mean? It apparently means that the present declaration is a "Sūtra", and the former declaration was "Bhāṣya" which derived its authority from this Sūtra. This is clearly stated in the Bhāṣyatandra which says—'The Bhāṣya has already shown that there is no restriction as to precedence, sequence or simultaneity among Pramānas and the Sūtra now proceeds to show one of these three methods

then, here we have a case where we apprehend the 'object of cognition' (the musical instrument) which has a prior existence by means of the 'means of cognition' (Sound) which comes into existence after the former

The Sutra has cited this one instance (of the posteriority of Pramāṇa) by way of illustration, as examples of the other two ways (priority and simultaneity of Pramāṇa and Prameya), we may take those that have already been cited above

"Why are not those examples cited here (rather than there)?"

We are only explaining here what has already been stated before. All that we have got to do is to state the facts, it does not make any difference whether it is stated here or on the previous occasion

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The names '*Pramāṇa*' and '*Prameya*' are applied according to circumstances, such application depending upon certain causes that go to determine the name, such cause or circumstance, in the case in question consists in the fact that (a) that which is the means of bringing about an apprehension is called '*Pramāṇa*', (b) that which is the object apprehended is called '*Prameya*', and (c) when that which, though itself an apprehended object, happens to be the means of the apprehension of something else, then that same thing may be called '*Pramāṇa*' as well as '*Prameya*'. This is the fact brought out in the following Sutra

Sutra 16

The weighing balance, which is a Pramāṇa [the means of ascertaining the weight of things], is Prameya also, [as regards its own accuracy] *

* All the Mss of the *Bhāṣya*, except one read प्रमेया, so do also the *Tatparjya*, the *Nyāyāṣi*, *cimbanda* and the *Bhāṣyacandra*. But some Mss of the *Īrṭika* and all the later commentators read प्रमेयता. The sense is that प्रमेयता also belongs to Pramāṇas as we find in the case of a particular Pramāṇa the Balance. प्रमेयता च भवति यथा तुलाख्य प्रमाणे दृश्यते, in this case तुलाप्रामाण्यवत् is a compound word. With the reading प्रमेया the construction is तुला प्रामाण्यवत् प्रमेया च भवति, यथा इयं प्रमाणम्भवात् तथा प्रमेया ऽपि, in this case तुला and प्रामाण्यवत् are not taken as a compound. The purport of the Sutra is the same in both cases.

BHĀṢYA

'The weighing balance is called '*Pramāna*' when it is the means of bringing about the cognition of the exact weight (of the thing weighed),—in which case the object of cognition is the weighty substance, gold and the like (which is weighed), which therefore is called '*Prameya*',—but when the gold thus weighed is made the means of testing (ascertaining the accuracy of) another balance, then in the cognition (of the accuracy) of this other balance, it becomes the '*Pramāna*', and the other balance becomes the '*Prameya*' *.

What we have just said (in regard to the application of the names '*Pramāna*' and '*Prameya*' depending on circumstances) applies to all topics of the *S'āstra* †. For instance the Soul has been prominently mentioned among '*Prameyas*', because it is an object of cognition, but it is '*Pramātr Cogniser*', also inasmuch as (in regard to the action of *cognising*!) it is the independent agent,—similarly *Buddhi*, '*Apprehension*', (of Invariable Concomitance, for instance) is '*Pramāna*', inasmuch as it is the means of cognising things, and yet it becomes '*Prameya*' when it is itself *cognised* and it comes to be called mere '*Pramuti*', '*apprehension*', when it is neither the means nor the object of any cognition. Similarly, the conditions governing the application of the names in question may be applied to other particular categories (of Doubt etc.) also.

As a matter of fact, the names of the several case relations or active agencies (*Karakas*) are applied (promiscuously) through varying causes (depending on the character of the things concerned). For instance, when we say 'the tree stands,' § (*vrksah*

* When we are weighing gold, the Balance is a pure *Pramāna* being the means whereby we know the weight of the gold. But when doubts arise as to the accuracy of a balance, then what is done is that a piece of gold, whose weight has been already ascertained by means of a reliable balance is weighed again in the balance of doubtful accuracy, and if the weights tally, the balance is proved 'accurate', so that in regard to its accuracy, the balance becomes an object of cognition '*Prameya*', the resultant cognition in this case being in the form, 'this balance is accurate'.

† In this passage the Author reminds us of what he has already said in the *Bhāṣya* or *Sū* 1-1-1—says *Bhāṣyacandra*.

§ The *Bhāṣyacandra* takes *tisthati* as 'lives'

(i.e. by its own action), becomes the means of accomplishing the other act;—similarly the name 'objective' applies to that which is the most desired to be got at by the action, and not to mere substance or to action, and so with what is the 'principal means of accomplishing', and so on. In these cases we have found that, just as in point of fact the names of the active agencies (*Kāraṅgas*) are applied, neither to the mere substance, nor to the mere action but to that which, being endowed with a particular action of its own, helps in the bringing about of some other action,—so also the same follows from the definitions of the 'active agencies', and as the words '*Pramāṇa*' and '*Prameya*' also are expressive of active agency (case relation, '*Pramāṇa*' being the *Instrument* and '*Prameya*' the *Object*, of cognition), they cannot renounce what is in the very nature of 'active agencies'.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The Purvapaksin urges the following argument —

"Well, Sir, we admit that the *Kāraṅga*-names are used according to their capacity so that Perception and the rest are '*Pramāṇa*', 'Instruments of Cognition' as they are the cause of the action of cognising and they are also '*Prameya*' object of cognition, as they are the objects of the action of cognising, thus then Perception and the rest are *objects* of cognition as well as *instruments* of cognition,* as is vouched for by such specific assertions (met with in common parlance) as—(a) 'I know this by Perception', 'I know this by Inference' 'I know these by Analogy' 'I know this by Word' [where Perception etc figure as the *means*]—or (b) 'My cognition (which is apprehended) is Perceptual', 'My Cognition is Inferential' 'My Cognition is Verbal', [where they are apprehended as the *Object of Cognition*]. So also when these same Perception and the rest, are described by their definitions—e.g., 'the cognition produced by the contact of the object with the sense-organ' and so forth—they come to be specifically known [in which case they themselves form the *objects* of cognition]. Now the question arises—Is this Cognition

* According to the *Bhāṣyadarśa*, the term '*pramāṇas*' here stands for (1) *Instruments of Cognition* and (2) *Cognition*—reading the passage as सर्वज्ञान प्रत्यक्षादिति प्रमाणान च.

inference being in the form, 'the Perception must be due to actual contact of the object with the sense organ, because we find that there is absence of Perception whenever sense-object contact is absent by reason of obstructions to such contact' *—(d) that the Cognition is produced by the sense object contact is apprehended,† just like pleasure, etc., through its inherence in the Soul as accompanied by a peculiar contact of the Mind with the cognising Soul (as encased in the bodily membrane) ‡ Similarly may every other Instrument of Cognition be analysed [and found to have several factors apprehended by means of one or the other of the four ordinary Instruments of Cognition].

Thus then [the meaning of the Sutra is that] in the case of the lamp light it is found that while it is itself visible (*object of vision*) it is also the *means* of the seeing of other visible things and thus it comes to be called the 'object,' or the 'means' of Cognition according to circumstances, similarly any other thing though an *object* of Cognition, may also be the *means* of the Cognition (of something else) and thus come to be called the 'object' or the 'means' of Cognition according to circumstances. So that the Cognition of Perception and the other Instruments of Cognition also is actually found to be brought about *not* by a

* The Eye and all its auxiliaries being present if it is found that there is no seeing and it is also found that the range of vision is obstructed by a wall which is actually seen to intervene between the Eye and the Object sought to be seen and again it is found that when the wall is not there the Object is seen all right — these facts lead to the conclusion that in every case of seeing there is actual contact of the Object with the sense-organ. The Bhāṣyacandra formulates the inferences as follows — (1) The Wall is actually in contact with the Eye because it is *seen* — what is not in contact with the Eye is not seen as we find in the case of things hidden behind the wall — (2) 'the Eye is in contact with the wall because it is the instrument bringing about the perception of the wall — whenever an organ is instrumental in bringing about the perception of a thing it is in contact with the thing as we find in the case of the organ of Touch — (3) 'Sense-organs must be in contact with the Object because they are instruments like the Eye and so on

† That is perceived—says the Bhāṣyacandra

‡ The Bhāṣyacandra takes मयोमविशेषान् as meaning मयागमविशेषान् and as qualifying आत्मगमवापान्, and the last च in the sense of emphasis only

different set of Instruments of Cognition, nor entirely without the aid of all instrumentality

The Opponent might urge that— there can be no apprehension of a thing by itself", but our answer to this will be that the argument is not right, as the things are really different from one another, and they are only similar in character. What the Opponent means to urge is that— it is not right to hold that Perception etc. are apprehended by means of Perception etc. themselves, for a thing is always apprehended by means of something other than itself"—but this argument is not right as in reality there is difference among the individual things which however are possessed of a similar character (by virtue of which they have a common name), so that (in the case in question it is found that) the character of 'Perception' belongs to and includes several individuals (i.e. particular perceptions), and among these one individual (Perception) could well be apprehended by means of another individual (Perception) and in this there could be no incongruity,—similarly in the case of Inference and the other Instruments of Cognition,—(to take a homely instance) we find that by means of the water brought out (of the well) we have the cognition (inferential) of water in the well itself [where we have the apprehension of *water* by means of *water* itself]. The same we find to be the case with the Cognising Soul and Mind. When we have such cognitions as 'I am happy', 'I am unhappy' we find that the cogniser (the Soul) is apprehended by himself, and in the case of Mind also we find that it has been declared that 'the non-simultaneity of cognitions is an indicative of the Mind' (Su 1-1 16) which means that the inference of the Mind is brought about by means of the Mind itself—so that there is no difference between the *cogniser* and the *cognised* (in the case of the Soul), and between the *means* of apprehension and *object** of apprehension (in the case of the Mind)

* The *Viz* text reads *ग्रहणस्य* which is evidently wrong the *Pari* MSS read *ग्रहणस्य*, and this has the support of the *Tatp* *rya* also which has the following observations on this paragraph of the *Bhasya*—It is not quite right to speak of the Soul as the *object** of the action of *cognition* for the *objective* is that which bears on itself the action of something other than itself the real objective of the cognition 'I am happy' is the *happy*

The Opponent might urge that in the cases cited the auxiliary conditions are different, but our answer to this will be that so it is also in the case of Perception etc. It is true that in the case of the cognising Soul, the Soul does not cognise itself (i.e. becomes the object of cognition) except under conditions different (from those under which it is the cogniser),—similarly the Mind also is apprehended by means of the Mind under entirely different conditions, but precisely the same is the case with Perception and the other Instruments of Cognition, for when Perception etc. are apprehended by means of Perception etc. themselves, we are cognisant of total difference between the two* individual perceptions (the Perception cognised and the Perception by means of which it is cognised).

Then again, there is no possibility of there being anything that cannot be apprehended by Perception etc. If there were any such thing as is not apprehended by Perception and the other three Instruments of Cognition, then there might be some ground for the postulating of additional Instruments of Cognition, but as a matter of fact no one can point out any such thing, for the simple reason that everything, existing as well as non-existing† is actually found to be apprehended by Perception etc.—as we find to be the case in ordinary experience.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Some people have taken up the example (cited in the preceding Sūtra) by itself, quite detached from any reasonings,—i.e. as proving the conclusion (that Pramāṇas are self-illuminated) by itself, without reference to any particular reasoning and they have interpreted the Sūtra to mean that—just as the lamp-light is seen without the light of any other lamp, so also are the

ness and the Soul only figures in the cognition as the illuminating factor. The Mind is certainly an instrument in the cognition of itself and is also the object yet this does not involve the incongruity of a thing operating upon itself, because it is by its own existence that the Mind is the instrument of its own cognition and certainly the existence of the Mind is some thing entirely different from the Cognition of the Mind.

* The *Viṣ* text wrongly retains the *त*, all MSS. including the two Paris MSS. have dropped it. The *Bhāṣya* and *commentary* also has no *त*.

† How the non-existent thing forms the object of Pramāṇas has been shown in the introductory *śloka*.

Pramanas apprehended without other Pramanas' * But such an argument—

Sutra 20

Cannot be conclusive as in the case of certain things we find that other instruments are inoperative while in others it is found that they are not inoperative

BHĀṢYA

(A) The said fact (of independence of other Pramanas), which is deduced from the absence of operation (of other lamps in the case of the lamp illuminating things by its light), has been urged (by the writers referred to) with a view to prove similar independence in the case of the Instruments of Cognition—but the same fact might be urged (with equal reasonableness) to prove similar independence in the case of the Objects of Cognition also as there is nothing to distinguish this latter case from the former [i.e. just as it is argued, from the case of the lamp being independent of another lamp that Pramanas are independent of other Pramānas, so may it also be argued that Prameyas also are independent of Pramanas—which would mean that Pramanas are not necessary for anything]—(B) Further it may be argued that so far as the cognition of the *objects of cognition* is concerned it is found that for the apprehension of such things as the colour of a Dish and the like one does require the operation of such aids as the light of a lamp [so that the example of the *lamp* proves the necessity of such aids in the case of the cognition of *objects of cognition*] and the same might be said in regard to the cognition of the Pramanas also whose case does not differ from the former case [The argument would be that, just as in the case of the apprehension of *objects of cognition* such aids as lamp light &c. are necessary so in the case of the apprehension of the Pramanas also such other aids would be necessary]—† [Thus then the example of the Lamp as interpreted by the said writers being

* This is the argument propounded by those who regard all Pramanas to be *self illuminated*—i.e. the Vedantins and Mīmāṃsakas

† According to the *Bhāṣyatandra* the meaning of this passage is as follows—The colour of the Dish is perceptible by itself and yet for being *illuminated* it requires the aid of the Lamp light so the Pramanas also even though they may be *self illuminated* may stand in need of other Pramanas

found to support both views—unless the said example is taken in reference to a particular reasoning (as we have taken it), there could be no justification for accepting its force in one case and not in the other, as there is no reason why the force of the Example should be admitted in one case and not in the other.

*On the other hand if the Example (of the lamp) is taken in reference to a particular reasoning (as we have taken it), it is found to point to a single conclusion, and as such it is not open to the objection just mentioned.** That is to say, when the example is taken as bearing upon a particular reasoning, it is found to point to a single conclusion (that one Instrument of Cognition is independent of other Instruments of Cognition), and under the circumstances, the Opponent cannot very well refuse to accept its force † Such being the case, this interpretation is not open to the objection that the Example is not conclusive.

"But if Perception &c were apprehended by other Perception &c, then there would be an infinite regress. Not so we reply, as all usage could be rightly explained on the basis of the distinction that the said Perception &c, are apprehended (in one case) as the objects cognised and (in another case) as the instruments of the cognition. For instance when we have such notions as 'I cognise the thing by means of Perception', I cognise the thing by means of Inference' Perception &c are cognised as the instruments of cognition, and when we have such notions as 'this cognition of mine (which I now cognise) is perceptual', 'this cognition is inferential', 'this cognition is verbal', Perception &c appear as the objects of cognition,—so that when we actually recognise them thus (differently in the two cases), it becomes possible for us to carry on all business for the purpose of acquiring merit, prosperity, happiness and Final Release, and also for the purpose avoiding the contraries of these. And as all business and usage can be explained on the basis of the said distinction there is nothing to be accomplished by the infinite regress for the accomplishment of which it would be necessary to postulate the said infinite regress (of Perception &c.)

* The *Bhāṣyacandra* reads this as तद्वत्

† 'ज्ञानम्' of the 12 text is wrong. The Puri MSS. and the *Bhāṣya* *and* *and* support the reading अननुज्ञानम्

SECTION (3)
Detailed Examination of Perception

Sūtras 21-33

BHĀṢYA

The Pramāṇas have been examined in a general way They are now going to be examined in detail

Sūtra 21

Pūrvapakṣa —“The statement of the Cause (in Sū 1 1 4) of Sense Perception is untenable as it is an incomplete Statement ”

BHĀṢYA

“That is to say, another cause (of Perception)—the contact of the Mind with the Soul—has not been mentioned ”

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Pūrvapakṣa (continued)—“As a general rule unless an object is in contact with something, there cannot be produced in it any such quality as can be produced by contact —and we know that the quality of ‘Cognition’ is produced in the Soul,—so the conclusion is that the contact of this Soul with the Mind is a cause of that Cognition Then as regards the Sense-Mind contact, if the cause of Cognition consisted in Sense-object contact, independently of the Sense-Mind contact, it would be possible for several cognitions to appear simultaneously, and (since this is impossible vide Sū 1-1-15) therefore Sense-Mind contact also should be regarded as a cause of Perception ”

What has been just said constitutes the anticipated Bhāṣya on the next Sūtra.

Sūtra 22

“Perception cannot be brought about unless there is contact of the Soul and of the Mind (hence of the contact of these should have been mentioned in the Sūtra 1 1 4)

“Just as no Perception is brought about until there is contact of the Sense and the Object, so also no Perception is brought about unless there is contact of the Soul and of the Sense organ. (hence this latter also should be mentioned among the ‘Cause of Perception’).”

Sūtra 27

Also because in the case of persons whose Mind is asleep or preoccupied, (Perception is held to be) brought about by means of the contact of the Sense organ and Object (only)

BHĀṢYA

We have (in the definition of 'Perception') the mention of the Sense-object contact, and not that of Mind Soul contact, also because &c &c (A) Sometimes a man goes to sleep after having determined that he would wake up at a certain time,—and by force of this determination (which gives rise to the effort necessary for bringing about the requisite Mind Soul Contact) he wakes up at that time, but sometimes it happens that during sleep he is awakened either by a very loud sound or by a forcible shaking and in these cases the waking Cognition (of Sound and Touch) by the sleeping man is brought about (primarily) by the Contact of the Sense organ so that predominance belongs, not to the contact of either the Cognising Soul or the Mind but to the Contact of the Object with the Sense organ, because in such cases there is no *desire to know* on the part of the Soul to give rise to its effort which could urge the Mind and bring it into Contact with it (and it is only when this happens that Mind Soul contact is possible)

(B) In other cases what ordinarily happens is that when the man, though having his Mind entirely occupied with the Cognition of one thing *desires* to cognise (think of) another thing there appears his effort which brings about the contact of his Mind with that thing, of which he then becomes duly cognisant (and in this case we have the Contact of the Mind and of the Soul also) Now in the case in which the man having his Mind entirely preoccupied there appears in him a Cognition brought about by the forcible sudden impact of the Object, without any *desire to cognise* or *mental effort* on his part—the contact of the Sense-organ with the Object is the principal cause of the Cognition, as in this case there is no *desire to cognise* on the part of the man and hence no effort which could urge the Mind (into Contact with the undesirable object) And because it is the principal cause it is the Sense object contact that should be mentioned (in the definition of

Perception), and not the Mind Soul contact which is only a subordinate factor

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

There is another reason for regarding the Sense-object contact as the predominant factor

Sūtra 28

And also because Individual Cognitions are named after these

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact we find that individual cognitions are named after the Sense organs and the Objects concerned 'How so?

For instance (a) when one smells with the olfactory organ, his Cognition is called 'olfactory Cognition' and 'Cognition of smell' (b) when he sees with the Visual organ the Cognition is called 'visual Cognition' and Cognition of colour (c) when he tastes with the Gestatory organ the Cognition is called 'gestatory Cognition' and 'Cognition of taste' Further Perception is held to be of five kinds, simply because of the number of sense organs and that of perceptible objects being each five fold And all this goes to prove that in the bringing about of Perception the Sense object contact is the principal cause

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The Opponent says — It has been urged by the Siddhāntin (in Su 26) that the mention of *Sense object Contact* is necessary, not that of the Mind soul Contact because in the case of the man whose mind is asleep or pre occupied, Perception is brought about by the contact of the Sense organ with the Object (only) But this—

Sūtra 29

"Is not a sound reasoning as it involves self contradiction"

BHĀṢYA

"If you do not accept Mind soul contact to be the cause of any Perception, this would be contradictory to what has been said before (in Su 1-1-16) to the effect that *the non-simultaneity of*

quality of it which is produced by the defects (of Passion etc) in its activity (this quality being in the shape of 'Adṛṣṭa', 'Unseen Force', Destiny), and it is by this quality that the Mind would be impelled (in cases where there is no effort or Desire) and come into contact with the Sense organs. If the Mind were not impelled by this quality, then (as there would be nothing else that could urge it into contact) there would be no contact, no cognition would appear—so that the said quality would fail to be universally effective (in regard to all Substances, Qualities and Actions),—and yet it is essential that this particular quality of the Soul (Adṛṣṭa) should be all effective towards Substances Qualities and Actions, for otherwise, as there would be nothing else to give rise to the (initial) activity (motion) of the four minutely material atoms or of the Minds (at the beginning of Creation) there would be no possibility of any such thing being produced as the Body, the Sense-organs and the Objects.

SECTION 4

Consideration of the view that Perception is the same as Inference

Sūtra 31

Pūrvapakṣa—"Perception is only Inferential Cognition—as it is a cognition that proceeds from the Cognition of a component part

BHĀṢYA

(The Pūrvapakṣin says)—The cognition—this is a tree'—arising from the contact of the object and the sense-organ is what is called (by you) 'Perception'. But (according to us) this is only an *Inference*. How so? Because the (said) cognition of the tree proceeds from the apprehension of one of its parts. When the observer cognises the tree, what he actually perceives is only its part nearest to himself and certainly that one part is not the tree. So that (when the man cognises the tree' as a whole) what happens is that there is an inference of it (from the perception of its one part) just like the inference of fire from the apprehension of *Smoke*'.

(The Siddhāntin meets the Pūrvapakṣa with a question)—What is that *something* different from the perceived part, which you regard as being the object of *Inference* (and not of *Perception*)?

(The Opponent answers)—“There are two views in regard to the constitution of Objects. By one view an Object is only an aggregate of certain component parts, while by the other it is a distinct *Composite Substance* produced out of its component parts,—now according to the former view, what are *inferred* from the apprehension of one part are the other component parts (other than the one that is perceived), while according to the other view, what are *inferred* are those other parts as well as the Composite whole made up of the parts.”

(Now the Siddhāntin urges his real objection against the Purvapākṣa view)—(a) According to the view that the Object is only an aggregate of parts—it would not be possible for any cognition of the ‘tree’ to proceed from the apprehension of any one part, for just as the perceived part is not the ‘tree’, so the *unperceived part* also is not the ‘tree’ (So that the inference of the unperceived part cannot be regarded as the ‘cognition of the tree’, which thus becomes impossible)

“What happens is that from the apprehension of one part proceeds the inference of another part, and this is followed by a remembrance of all the conglomerated parts which ultimately brings about the cognition of the ‘tree’.”

In that case the ‘cognition of the tree’ cannot be called *inferential* (as it would be pure remembrance)

(b) According to the other view,—that the Object is a *composite substance* made up of component parts—it would be impossible for the composite whole to be *inferred* for (even according to you) if the composite whole is to be *inferred* from the apprehension of a part, there must be a previous perception of that whole as related to that part (as without the perception of such relation no inference would be possible)—and if the Composite Whole is *perceived*, then, being as much perceived as the one part, it cannot be held to be an object of *inference*.

Thus the conclusion is that the cognition of the ‘tree’ cannot be regarded as *inferential*.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

In Su 31, the Purvapākṣin has admitted the cognition of a part and then argued that Perception is only Inference, but the

of the Probandum and Probans as related to each other or in that of the (subsequent) perception (in the Subject) of the Probans by itself—and certainly these two perceptions cannot be regarded as Inference for the simple reason that they are brought about by the contact of the Sense-organ with the Object, and Inference does not proceed from any such contact of the Object of inference with the Sense-organs. This is an important point of difference in the characters of Inference and Perception and this has to be accepted

Sūtra 33

Nor is there the cognition of one component part as the composite whole is also there (and this also is cognised)

BHĀṢYA

[The Author points out another weak point in the Purvapaksa argument of Su 30]—In no case is there a cognition of any single component part only in fact there is cognition of one component part and of the composite which is inseparable from (composed of) that component part. How so? *Because there is the composite whole* as a matter of fact there is the composite whole which is something distinct from the component parts and when this composite occupies the same point in space as the component part it should be amenable to all the conditions of perceptibility (to which the component part is amenable) and under the circumstances when there is perception of the component part it is not possible that there be no perception of the composite

But there is no apprehension of all (the parts) —This is not right as the one part (of the Composite whole) has no existence apart from its (constituent) cause (The sense of the Purvapaksa argument now put forward is as follows)—As a matter of fact all the component parts are not perceived some parts being hidden from view by other parts and under the circumstances the whole of the Composite (even if such Composite were admitted) could never be perceived specially as the Composite does not subsist in its entirety in any of those parts that are perceived so that the cognition of one part still remains (as the cause of the inference of the entire Composite whole)

But, says the Siddhāntin in answer to the above, the term 'entire' ('whole') is used only when (of several things) all are meant, and the term 'non entire' ('partial') is used when a few of them are left out (and only a few are meant), thus then both these terms ('entire' and 'non entire') are applicable only to several things, which are perceived when not hidden, and are not perceived when hidden (and certainly the Composite is never hidden by its component parts)

You please answer the following question—When the Composite is perceived, what of it is there which is not perceived which could justify your assertion that there is cognition of only the part (and not of the *whole*)? Certainly, of the Composite whole there are no parts' apart from its constituent causes (its components), and it is not right to regard the *composite* as of the same nature as the component parts. The character of the *Composite* is such that it is perceived as along with those parts that are perceived, and it is not perceived as along with those that are not perceived on account of obstruction. Certainly this (perception and non-perception) does not bring about a diversity (in the Composite)

[The Siddhāntin next takes up the view that the Composite is nothing but the aggregate of component parts)—The *composite* 'Tree' (according to this view) would consist either—(a) in the entirety (multiplicity) of the components, or (b) in the conjunction (combination) of the components,—in either case apprehension of it would not be possible. That is to say—(a) either the *composite* 'Tree' would consist in the entirety of the root, the trunk, the branch, the leaves and other components—or it would consist in the conjunction of these components, in either case any apprehension of the 'Tree' as a *composite* whole would be impossible, as in the first place, certain parts (the back part, for instance) would always be hidden from view by the obstruction of other parts (for instance, the front part),—which would make it impossible for the parts to be apprehended *in their entirety*, and secondly, as for the *conjunction of the parts*, this also could not be apprehended, for the simple reason that all the conjuncts (parts) are not apprehended

Thus then, the conclusion is that the cognition of the 'tree', accompanying (and following from) the 'cognition of one part'

[The Opponent objects to the reasoning as follows]—‘As a matter of fact, the *Holding and Drawing* are due to *adhesion*—this *adhesion* being a particular quality (of the components themselves) which is concomitant with (their) *conjunction* and which is produced by viscosity and fluidity through the contact of water in the unbaked jar, and through the contact of fire in the baked jar. If these two (*Holding and Drawing*) were due to the (fact of the thing being a) Composite then they could be perceived even in such things, as a *heap of dust* (which cannot be either *held* or *drawn*, simply because there is no *adhesion* among the dust particles), and they could not be possible in the case of several things, like the straw, stone and wood, packed up together by means of lac,—where the packed up bundle does not become a new substance (different from the component *wood* etc.). [So that the case of this bundle is not analogous to that of the Jar composed of atoms, which is held to be something different from the component atoms and yet the said bundle of wood etc. is capable of being *held* and *drawn*, simply because there is *adhesion* due to the lac]’ *

*The Composite must be something different because there is possibility of its being held and drawn. The *Parīśuddhi* remarks that in the form in which the Probans—*possibility of drawing and holding*—is put forward it is one that does not subsist in the Subject Composite the proper probans should be धारणाकर्षणवत्त्वात्, because it is possessed of the capability of being held and drawn. This same difficulty is avoided by the *Tatparya* by formulating the reasoning in the negative form—“The Jar and other things that we see which are suspected to be mere aggregates of atoms cannot be non-composites—because if they were so there would be no possibility of their being held and drawn—as we find that whatever is non-composite like Cognition is never held and drawn—while Jar and such other things are always capable of being held and drawn—hence these latter cannot be non-composites.

* Thus by the two examples of *Dust Heap* and *Straw wood-bundle* it is shown that what is invariably concomitant with Holding is *adhesion* and not Composite character.

For अवयविकारिते some Miss read अवयवकारिते

It is noteworthy that the *Bhāṣya* contents itself with this *Purvapakṣa* argument and does not supply the answer to it. It would appear, from this that the objection has the acceptance of the *Bhāṣya* kṛta Vāchaspati Miśra says that this दूषणम्, objection to the reasoning of the Sūtras is

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Question—“The man who denies the Composite, and, with a view to avoid the contingency of Perception becoming impossible, holds that what is perceived is the *aggregate of Atoms*,—what is there to urge against such a man?”*

Answer †—Such a person should be asked to explain what is the object of the unitary conception that we have in the idea of ‘one thing’, the question put to him being in the form—does the Unitary Conception refer to (*i.e.* apprehend) a *non-diverse* (single) thing, or to diverse (several) things? If it be said to refer to a *non-diverse* thing, then, this view would admit the *non-diverse thing* to be something different (from the components, which are *diverse*), so that what we call the ‘composite’ would be admitted,—if, on the other hand, it be held to refer to

परमैत, from the standpoint of the Opponent, but in that case the answer should have been given, as it has been given in the Vārtika. The *Bhāṣya-sādhya* explains that the Pupil upon hearing the aforesaid reasonings of the opponent, puts the question embodied in the next sentence of the *Bhāṣya* as to what answer should be given to these arguments of the opponent. Then comes the answer from the stand-point of the *Siddhānta* (See below.)

It is well worth considering whether or not we can in some way, interpret the *Bhāṣya* as putting forward an argument in support of the *Siddhānta* view. We have a clue to this in the reading of some MSS., which read अवयवकृते for अयविकृते. Accepting this reading we can translate the whole passage in the following manner, and thus make it an argument in support of the *Siddhānta*—‘Holding and Drawing are always found to be due to *massiveness*: this *massiveness* is a distinct quality concomitant with *conjunction*, which is produced by *viscosity* and *fluidity*, through contact of water, in the unbaked jar, and through contact of fire, in the baked jar, if Holding and Drawing were due to the *components* themselves (and not to a *massive* substance composed of them), then they would be possible in the Dust-heap also (where the component dust-particles are present, even though there is no massive substance), and would not be possible in the case of straw-stone-and-wood bundled together with lac, as in this case (even though there is a massive substance) there is no *component* [the several heterogeneous substances not constituting one homogeneous whole, and as such not entitled to the name ‘component’].

* This question is addressed by the Pupil who has heard the above arguments on behalf of the Pūrvaśāstra and is anxious to learn how to meet them.

† The Teacher teaches the following answer.

diverse things (the many components), then, it would be a case of many things (Atoms) being perceived as one, which would be an absurdity (a case of pure misconception), as we never come across any such (right) notion as that of 'one' in regard to the many

Sūtra 37

[In answer to what has been just urged by the Siddhāntin, the Pūrvapakṣin might urge that]—"the said conception (of 'one' in regard to the Many) would be similar to the notion that we have in regard to such (collective) things as the 'Army' and the 'Forest'",—but even so the conception would not be possible, as Atoms are beyond the reach of the senses

BHĀṢYA

[Says the Pūrvapakṣin]—"In the case of the 'Army' and the 'Forest' it is found that when, on account of remoteness, the distinctness (and diversity) of the component factors is not perceived, the conception of their being 'one' becomes possible, analogously, many Atoms being massed together, when their distinctness (and diversity) fail to be perceived, the notion of these being 'one' becomes possible"

But in the case of the 'Army' and the 'Forest' what actually happens is that the diversity of the component factors of these is such as is ordinarily perceptible, but it fails to be perceived on account of an extraneous cause in the shape of *remoteness*,—similarly when there are several trees, the particular species to which each belongs—such as, 'Palāśa', 'Khadira' &c—is such as is ordinarily perceptible,* but it fails to be perceived on account of *remoteness*,—similarly again in the case of such things as have their (diverse) movements ordinarily perceptible, the (diverse) movement fails to be perceived on account of remoteness, and in all these cases what happens is that the (diverse component) things themselves are perceived, but their diversity fails to be perceived on account of remoteness, which (non perception

* Some printed texts read 'agrhyamāna', the MṂS do not show the 'a' and in the sentence preceding and following this we have 'grhyamāna' the Fāṛṣīka also explains the term as 'apalabhyamānagatīnam'. The translation has for these reasons adopted the reading without 'a'.

of diversity) makes it possible for the notion of 'one' to appear in regard to them, in a secondary (indirect, figurative) sense. The case of Atoms is entirely different,—in regard to these it is not true that their diversity is ordinarily perceptible, so that it cannot be said that the figurative notion of 'one' becomes possible when, for some reason, the said diversity fails to be perceived,—this cannot be said, for the simple reason that Atoms are 'beyond the reach of the senses' (and hence their diversity cannot be said to be ordinarily perceptible).

Further [the Opponent is not quite right in citing the case of the 'Army' and the 'Forest', for] what is being discussed (by us) is just this—whether or not the unitary conception refers to the 'mass of small particles', and the 'Army' and the 'Forest' also are just such 'mass of small particles' [so that these are as much open to discussion as any other Composite], and certainly it is not right to put forward as an example (in proof of a Proposition) something that is itself open to discussion, as such a thing is in the same position as what is meant to be proved (by the citing of that example) *

It might be argued that what has been put forward is what is actually seen (by all parties)—But even so it would not be right, as what is being discussed is just what exactly forms the object of the 'seeing' or 'perception'. That is to say, the Opponent might argue as follows: "It is a fact actually perceived that in the case of the 'Army' and the 'Forest', the distinction among the component parts not being perceived, the parts come to be looked upon as *non different*—which gives rise to the idea of these being 'one', and certainly what is actually perceived cannot be denied." But this is not quite right, what forms the object of perception is just what is being discussed [and has still got to be ascertained], the precise object of perception is what

* What the *Bhāṣya* means is that no corroborative example can be available for the Opponent who denies the compositeness of all things, so that for him every conceivable thing has its nature and constitution entering into the subject of his reasoning, his Proposition being that "all things in the world are mere masses of imperceptible small particles." When all things enter into this Proposition either no corroborative instance is available or if any were cited such citing would be clearly wrong.—*Tatparya*

What forms the necessary Prototype is the not on of *non diversity* (i. e. *unity*) that we have in the case of things perceived by other sense organs.

This also cannot be right as until special reasons are put forward, the mere citing of an example cannot establish any conclusion. What the Opponent means is as follows—"In the case of the object perceived by the other organs—e. g. Sound, perceived by the auditory organ—we find that there is unitary conception in regard to Sounds which are non-diverse in character (even according to us) *—and this unitary conception would be the Prototype of the unitary conception in regard to the many (atoms for instance). But even so the mere citing of an example would not lead to any definite conclusion for the simple reason that no special reason is adduced (in support of the conclusion). That is to say the question being—the unitary conception that there is in regard to the massed atoms—is this a conception of something as what it is not, like the conception of Post as Man? or is the actual state of things really as represented by the conception and hence the conception is of something as what it actually is like the notion of 'one sound' in regard to Sound which is really *one*. Until special reasons are adduced (in support of one view or the other) mere Examples only tend to accentuate the uncertainty. Further as a matter of fact the *Odour* (Sound and the rest) which are things perceived by other sense organs adduced as examples by the Opponent, also are mere *masses* or *aggregates* of (diverse) things, like the jar and as such cannot form correct examples (of unitary conception in regard to non-diverse things) †

* According to the Pūrvapakṣin all sounds are one and the same and hence conceived of as *one*. This is a case of really non diverse things conceived as one—a true unitary conception which will supply the Prototype for the unitary conception in regard to the diverse atoms.

† The Vaiśeṣikas hold that Sound is produced not only from Akāśa but also from such conglomerations of material substances as the Cloth for instance. So that according to them Sound is only a conglomeration of diverse things. Thus the notion of one in regard to them cannot be correct and unitary conception in regard to Sound cannot be the prototype of such conception in regard to the many atoms. According to the Naiyāyika also *unity*, which is a quality, cannot belong to Sound, which itself is a

The (well known) conceptions of (A) Magnitude, (B) Cojunction, (C) Motion, (D) Community and (E) Specific Individuality should also be urged against the person who denies the 'composite,' as what has been urged in connection with unitary conception is applicable to these conceptions also *

† The unitary conception (whenever it arises) must be regarded as arising in connection with what is really one, being the conception of something as what it really is, the special reason for this consisting in the fact that the said conception is co-extensive with the conception of magnitude. As a matter of fact, the two conceptions—'this is one' and 'this is large'—pertaining to the same object, become co-extensive, and from this it is known that 'that which is large is one'

'But the 'conception of Magnitude' consists only in the cognising of a certain peculiarity in the aggregate of Atoms' ‡

[The answer to this is as follows]—The said 'conception of magnitude', appearing in regard to Atoms which by their very nature have no magnitude, will only be a conception of something as what it is not (*i.e.* a wrong conception)—'What if it be so?' Well the (wrong) conception of something as what it is not must be dependent upon a prototype, so that the existence of the prototype becomes established which

quality, as no quality can subsist in a quality. So that according to both parties the unitary conception in regard to Sound is as 'secondary or indirect' as that in regard to the Atoms.—*Tatparya*

The *Parīśuddhi* adds—The notion of number wherever and when ever it appears is regarded as true when it is not sublated by any subsequent conception and when it is found to be so sublated it is regarded as wrong. According to this principle the notion of one in regard to Sound as also in regard to Atoms must be wrong as in both cases there is the subsequent notion that they are many not one.

* If you do not admit the composite thing you cannot account for such notions as (a)—this thing is large, (b) this is in contact with that (c) the horse (the individual animal that belongs to the community Horse) (d) is running. As none of these could ever appear in regard to mere Atoms which are imperceptible.—*Varṇaka*

† This anticipates the following question—According to you also how do you account for the notion of unity in connection with the many trees—there being as you say no special reason in favour of one view or the other?

‡ And it is not a particular kind of Dimension.—*Bhāṣyacandra*.

means that there must be a right conception of 'magnitude' in regard to something really possessed of magnitude [which conception alone could be the prototype of the wrong conception of magnitude in regard to Atoms, which have no magnitude] [And this proves that there must be some such substance as is really possessed of magnitude, and all the world does not consist of mere atoms]

"With regard to Sound we have the conception of 'small and 'large', and this conception of both 'smallness' and 'magnitude' (appearing in regard to the same thing Sound) would be the prototype of the notion of 'magnitude' in regard to the small Atoms"—That cannot be, as the said conception (in regard to *Sound*) apprehends (i.e. pertains to) only *faintness* and *loudness* for the simple reason that they do not presuppose the ascertainment of the exact dimension or extent of the Sound, as is done in the case of similar conceptions in regard to *substances* [That is to say, when one speaks of Sound as being 'small', what is meant is that it is weak *faint* and when one speaks of Sound being 'large' what is meant is that it is powerful, *loud*,—and the reason why this must be the meaning lies in the fact that the said conceptions do not presuppose the definite cognition of the exact extent or dimension of the Sound] For instance, when one conceives of the Sound as 'large' he does not have the idea that the Sound *extends so far*—the idea that he has in the case of (the conception of the *largeness* of) such things as the *Badara*, the *Amalaka* and the *Bilva* fruits (whose exact sizes are known)*

The conception that 'these two (visible) things are in contact' involves the cognition of contact having the same substratum as Duality (i.e. it implies the cognition of the *contact of two things* which proves that these two things must be *composites*, and not mere atoms)†

* The *Tatparya* remarks that the cognition of the exact extent of a thing is possible only when the size or dimension of that thing is perceptible. And certainly this is not possible in the case of either Sound or Atoms.

† The *Bhāṭṭya* formulates the argument thus—"The concept of 'these two must be right' because it is co extensive with the notion of 'these are in contact,—that which is not so co extensive is not right notion—as the notion of 'two moons'.

accepted, as the contact is cognised as subsisting in the same substratum with Duality, when we have the conception—'these two things are in contact,' we do not cognise the *contact* as subsisting in any manifold combinations of things [The cognition is always of the contact as subsisting in *two things*]. These *two things* perceived could not be in the shape of 'two Atoms', as no perception of 'two atoms' is possible (atoms being entirely imperceptible). From all this the conclusion is that what form the substratum of the contact are two such substances as are possessed of magnitude and form the substratum of Duality (*i.e., two large substances, not many small atoms*).

"As a matter of fact, Conjunction is only proximity culminating in impact, it is not something different (from the objects that are in contact)"—This is not true, as Conjunction does actually serve to produce (in things) something entirely different (from those things themselves), for instance Conjunction is found to be the cause (productive) of a sound (when the contact of the stick with the drum makes the drum sound), of colour (when the contact of the Jar with fire produces red colour in the Jar) and of motion (when the contact with the ground of the ball thrown down makes the ball rebound),—and unless an entirely distinct quality (in the shape of Conjunction) appeared in the two things (in contact), it could not be possible to ascertain what is the cause of the appearance of the said *sound, colour and motion*,—from all this it follows that Conjunction is a quality, distinct (from the conjoined things), and it is also directly perceived as such* (In common parlance) we have the denial also (of Conjunction),—for instance, when we say—'the Teacher is with the ear ring, and the Pupil is without the ear-ring' (where the former phrase affirms and the latter denies the conjunction of the Ring) [and what is thus denied must be something different from the Pupil's ear and the Ring], if a distinct quality (other than the two things) were not the object of the conception of 'Conjunction', then the said denial must pertain to something else, and in that case it behoves you to explain what it is that is denied (by the phrase 'the pupil is without the ear ring'),

* *Pratyaya* stands for *pratyakṣa*, says *Bhāṣyatandra*

that is to say, you should explain what is that something else (other than a distinct quality in the shape of 'Conjunction') which you recognise in another case, where two things are in contact, and which is denied by the phrase in question ('the pupil is without the ear ring') [And as a matter of fact no such explanation is possible]

[Thus then, Conjunction being a quality, distinct from the objects in contact] whenever Conjunction is perceived, it is perceived as subsisting in two large substances (and never in atoms), so that it can never be regarded as subsisting in Atoms [all which goes to prove the existence of the Composites as the substratum of Conjunction]

Lastly, (to be consistent) you have to deny the existence of 'Communities', which from the basis* of all comprehensive or inclusive conceptions, but if these were denied you could not have such limitation to cognitions as we have [in the shape of the restriction of the conception of 'horse' to only particular individual animals, and not to others, this restriction being possible only by the fact of those animals alone belonging to the Community 'Horse']

[The existence of Communities being thus undeniable] In as much as no Community could be manifested (or perceived) without a substratum, it is necessary to explain what that substratum is

If it be held that—' what forms the said substratum is only the Atoms arranged or grouped in a certain manner (and not any Composite substance)',—then it behoves you to explain whether the Atom to which the capability (to manifest the Community) belongs is itself in contact (with the perceiving organ) or not, that is to say, when a particular Community is cognised is it or is it not, cognised as subsisting in the Atom groups that are themselves in contact with the perceiving organ? If it be held that it is cognised as subsisting (and perceived) in the unperceived atoms,—then it would be

* The Bhāṣya uses the term 'śāṅga' which the Tīrthika explains as 'amitta', *danu*. The Tātparyā however explains it as 'probans' by which the passage would mean that the existence of communities is proved by comprehensive cognitions.

possible to perceive even such atoms as are hidden from view, that is to say, it would be possible to perceive the Community as subsisting in atoms hidden from view. If, on the other hand, it be held that the Community is perceived as subsisting in the *perceived* atoms, then it could not be manifested in the inner and back parts (of the thing), which (not being in contact with the perceiving organ) are *not perceived* (and this would be absurd).—"But there would be manifestation of the Community in that much of the thing as is perceived"—In that case only that much of the Atom would be the substratum (of the Community), and it would come to this that the substratum of the Community is only that much of the Atom as is perceived and in which that Community is cognised. And this would mean that when a certain *mass of atoms* is perceived, there is a diversity of things in it (that much which is perceived being one and that much which is not perceived being another) ! That is to say, when a certain mass of atoms in the shape of a *Tree* is perceived, there is perceived a plurality of trees—and each of those portions of the mass wherein the community 'Tree' is perceived would be a distinct Tree ! [which is absurd]

From all this we conclude that what serves to manifest a particular community is some such entirely distinct substance as subsists in the aggregated Atoms, and this distinct substance is the *Composite* (as something different from the component atoms)

SECTION 6

Examination of Inference

Sūtras 38-39

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Perception has been examined, we now start the examination of Inference

Sūtra 38

Pūrvapakṣa—"Inference cannot be an Instrument of Right Cognition,—as [in the particular instances cited of the three kinds of Inference] the Premises are untrue—in view of Obstruction, Demolition and Resemblance."

BHĀṢYA

"The word '*Apramāṇam*' in the Sūtra means that Inference cannot even once be the means of the (definite) right cognition of anything *

"(a) [Under Su 1-1-5 the *Bhāṣya* has cited as an instance of the '*S'ṣavāt*' Inference—the inference of the fact of it having rained up the river from perceiving the river to be full,—now] as a matter of fact, the river may be seen to be full also by reason of its course being blocked (by a dam), hence from the mere perception of the fullness of the river, to conclude that 'the Rain god has rained in the regions up the river' cannot be a correct Inference

"(b) [As an instance of the '*Pūrvavat*' Inference some writers have cited the inference that 'it is going to rain' from perceiving the ants running away with their eggs now] as a matter of fact, the running about of the ants with their eggs might be due to the demolition of their nests, so that from seeing the ants running about with their eggs, to conclude that 'it is going to rain' cannot be a correct Inference †

* The *Tatparyā* says that प्रतिपादकम् of the *Bhāṣya* must be taken in the sense of निव्यायक, because (the *Parīśuddhi* adds) some sort of cognition may be brought about by even wrong premises. The *Bhāṣya* *candra* also explains प्रतिपादकम् as प्रमितिकरणम्.

† '*Pūrvavat* Inference consists in the inferring of the effect from the perception of its cause but as a matter of fact the running about of the ants with the eggs cannot be regarded as the cause of rain, for the simple reason that there is rain even without the running about of the ants. The fact however which makes the ants running about an indication of coming rain is the fact that what brings about rain is some sort of commotion in the elements in the form, for instance of the rising of heat waves below the earth's surface, but before this commotion brings on rain it produces certain other phenomena also, and the running about of the ants is one of these phenomena,—the ants being turned out of their nests underground by the sudden rising of the heat waves and thus carrying away their eggs outside. So that the appearance of ants thus running about leads to the inference of the elemental commotion which is the precursor and cause of rain, and from this we go on to the inference that it is going to rain. In this manner alone can we regard the instance as one of *Pūrvavat* Inference. But it is possible that a man may infer the coming of rain, without regarding the ants running about as the cause of rain that is

(c) "[Some writers have cited the inference of the *presence of the peacock*—from the hearing of the peacock's scream; but] as a matter of fact, a man might be mimicking the peacock's scream; so that on account of this *resemblance* (between the real peacock's scream and the man's mimicking of it), the inference of the peacock's presence from hearing of what sounds like its scream cannot but be incorrect""

Sūtra 39

[*Reply to the Pūrvapakṣa-Sūtra*].—Not so, because [what are the real Probans in the three Inferences cited] are entirely different from—(a) such (rise of water) as is restricted to one place, (b) such (running about of ants with their eggs) as is due to fright, and (c) such (Peacock's scream) as is a mere resemblance of it

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, the 'falsity' that has been urged does not apply to Inference, it is clear that what is not an Inference has been mistaken for Inference (by the *Pūrvapakṣin*) 'How so?' Well, in reality, what can be rightly regarded as the Probans of an Inference is not anything in its mere unqualified (vague, general) form. For instance, [in the case of the three Inferences cited], (a) when one infers that 'the Rain god has rained in the regions above the river', from the fact that the river is full, he does so, not by merely perceiving *a rise in the river*, but by perceiving that the water previously existing in the river has become qualified (augmented) by rain-water,

it may be an act of simple inductive reasoning, in which case this would be an instance of the *Samanyatodṛṣṭa* Inference.

As a matter of fact the instance of *Purnavat* Inference cited by the *Bhāṣya* under 1-1-5 is the inference of coming rain from the gathering of clouds. The case of the ants running leading to the inference of coming rain has been cited by other writers.

* The *Vartika* takes this third instance as the inference of the presence of the peacock, hence we have adopted that view in the translation. But the fact appears to be, as pointed out by later commentators on the *Sūtra* that the inference is of the *presence of clouds*, so that the three cases could be then of past, future and present rains. But by the *Vartika's* interpretation also the third would be a case of inference of something *present*, the difference being that while the other two refer to *rain*, the third refers to something else.

that the velocity of the stream current has increased, and that the stream is carrying along in its course flakes of foam, fruits, leaves and logs of wood,*—(b) when one infers 'coming rain', he does so from the fact that whole hosts of ants are running about (calmly and peacefully) with their eggs,—and not only a few ants;—(c) and lastly, the third Inference (that of the presence of the Peacock from hearing the Peacock's scream) is wrong only when the scream is in reality not that of a Peacock, and the observer fails to perceive the fact that 'this what I am hearing is not the screaming of the Peacock, but some other sound resembling it', but when the observer hears a particular (qualified) kind of Sound (i.e., a Sound in the musical tone called 'sadja' in which the peacock's scream is always pitched), he realises that 'what he is hearing is that peculiar Sound which can emanate only from the peacock, and then what leads to the right Inference of the peacock's presence is that particular kind of Sound (pitched in the 'Sadja' tone, and not what merely resembles it vaguely), § such infallible Inference of the peacock's presence from its scream is drawn by serpents (who can never mistake any mimicking Sound to be the 'peacock's scream') Thus then it is clear that when a person tries to infer from the perception of an *un-qualified* thing something that can be inferred from the perception of a *particular qualified thing*, the fault lies with the inferring person, not with the Inference itself

* All these additional ideas do not arise when the rise is due to some obstruction placed in the course of the stream

† The *Bhāṣyavardha* explains प्रायस्य as प्राप्तिपुच्छस्य समवायस्य large number of ants running about in friendly groups

And when the running about is due to fright caused by the demolition of the nests there would be only a few of them running about distractedly and not hosts of them calmly and peacefully

§ So also in the first Inference it would be wrong only if the man failed to notice that the rise in the river was due to its course having been obstructed and the second Inference would be wrong only if the man failed to perceive that only a few ants were running about through fright caused by the destruction of a particular ant nest

SECTION 7

Examination of the nature of Time—specially the Present.

Sūtras 40-44

BHĀṢYA

It has been asserted (in the *Bhāṣya*, under Sū 115) that Inference is applicable to all three points of time *because it apprehends the three points of time*. Against this also* the following objection has been raised (by the Bauddha)—

Sūtra 40

[*Pūrvopakṣa*].—"There is no Present (Time), for when an object falls, the only possible points of time are—that which has been fallen through, and that which has to be fallen through."†

BHĀṢYA

"When the fruit becomes detached from the stalk (it falls and) comes gradually nearer and nearer to the ground, now while it is so nearing the ground, the space above the fruit (and below the tree) is *space traversed*, and the time related to that *traversed space* is "*that which has been fallen through*" (i.e. the *Past*), and the space below the fruit (and above the ground) is the *space to be traversed*, and the time related to this latter space is "*that which has to be fallen through*" (i.e. the *Future*),—and (apart from these two) there is no third space, in relation to which there could be the notion of *being traversed* which would give rise to the conception of the *Present Time*. From this we conclude that there is no such thing as *Present Time*."

Sūtra 41

[Answer to the *Pūrvopakṣa*].—"If there is no Present Time] the other two ('Past' and 'Future') also would be inconceivable, as these are relative to that

* The *Bhāṣyacandra* interprets the *cha* to mean that the opponent objects to the three points of time, just as he does to the three kinds of Reason (dealt with in the preceding Section)

† Dr. Satish Chandra Vidyabhusana finds in this Sūtra a distinct reference to the *माय्यनिवर्तन*. The mere mention of a doctrine, however, does not justify us to regard it as referring to any particular work.

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, Time is not manifested by (conceived of in relation to) Space, it is manifested by *Action** of falling, &1, so that we have the conception of the time that has been fallen through (i.e. Past Time) when the action of falling,—which is expressed by the phrase 'it falls'—has ceased and when that same action is going to happen, we have the conception of Time that has to be fallen through (i.e. Future Time), and lastly, when the action of the thing is perceived as going on at the time, we have the conception of 'Present' Time. Under the circumstances, if a person were never to perceive the action as 'going on' at the time what could he conceive of as 'having ceased' or as 'going to happen'? For as a matter of fact, what is meant by 'time having been fallen through' is that the action of 'falling' is over, has ceased, and what is meant by 'time to be fallen through' is that the action is going to happen, so that at both these points of time (Past and Future) the object is devoid of the action, whereas when we have the idea that the thing 'is falling', the Object is actually connected (imbued) with the action, so that what the Present Time apprehends (indicates) is the actual existing connection of the Object and the Action, and thus it is only on the basis of this (existing connection and the time indicated by it) that we can have the conception of the other two points of Time (Past and Future), which latter, for this reason, would not be conceivable if the 'Present' Time did not exist. [Thus then all the three points of Time being realities, there is nothing wrong in the idea that 'Inference is applicable to the three points of Time']†

* It is true Time is conceived of only in relation to some *Kriya* but *Kriya* stands for action in general, not for mere motion as the opponent has taken it.—*Bhāṣyacandra*

† The reality of the conception the thing is falling—on which the idea of Present Time is based—cannot be denied, as it is attested by direct Perception—says the *Parasuddhi*. If the present action were not there what would be there that is produced by the gravity of the thing when its support has been removed (and when it falls)? Whose effect would it be that the thing touches the ground? Neither the Past nor the Future could be the effect or the cause as they are non-existent at the time.—*Tātpary*

Sūtra 42

Then Again—

As a matter of fact, the conceptions of 'Past' and 'Future' cannot be merely relative to each other

BHĀṢYA

If the conceptions of 'Past' and 'Future' could be merely relative to each other,—'accomplished on the basis of each other',—then we might accept the rejection of the 'Present'. As a matter of fact, however, neither the conception of 'Future' can be based upon the conception of the 'Past', nor that of the 'Past' can be based upon that of the 'Future'. By what reasoning and by what means would the conception of 'Past' be obtained?—How too in relation to the notion of 'Past' would you obtain the notion of 'Future'?—Or by what means would you get at the conception of the 'Future' at all? That is to say, all this cannot be explained, if you reject the 'Present' time.

It might be urged that—"there are several such pairs of relative conceptions as '*long and short*', '*ground and underground*', '*light and shade*', where one is merely relative to the other, and in the same manner the conceptions of '*past and future*' could be accomplished entirely in relation to each other."

This, however, cannot be accepted, in the absence of special reasons. That is to say, just as you have cited some examples (of relative terms), so could we also cite some counter-examples (to show that conceptions do not arise merely in relation to each other), for instance, just as the pairs of conceptions as '*colour and touch*', '*odour and taste*' are such in which the conceptions are not merely relative to each other, in the same manner the conceptions of '*past and future*' also could not be accomplished entirely in relation to each other. [And unless you have adduced some special reason in favour of the effectiveness of your examples, we cannot accept them in the face of these counter-examples.] [We have answered your argument after assuming that the instances you have cited are really those of purely relative conceptions.] As a matter of fact, however, there can be no conceptions which are accomplished merely in relation to each other; for if one were entirely dependent upon the other, then, the negation of one would

imply the negation of the other and thus there would be negation of both, that is to say if the existence of one were entirely dependent upon the other, then, upon what would the existence of the former be dependent?—And if the existence of the former depended upon the other, on what would the existence of this latter depend?—And thus as in the absence of the one the other could not be possible the result would be that both would be impossible

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Further, *Present Time* is indicated by the existence of things,—as we find in such conceptions as 'the Substance exists', 'Quality is there' 'Motion is there', and so on * So that for one who does not admit this—

Sūtra 43

There being no 'Present' there could be no cognition of anything (by any Instrument of Cognition) as no Perception would be possible †

BHĀṢYA

Perception is brought about by the contact of the sense organ with the object ‡ and that which is not *present*—that is (ex hypothesi) which is non-existent—cannot be in contact with a sense-organ and there is nothing which our Opponent accepts as *present* or *existing* so that for him there can be no cause of perception (in the shape of sense-object contact) no object of perception (in the shape of existing things) and no perceptual cognition And there being no Perception there could be no Inference or Verbal Cognition as both of these are based upon Perception Thus all Instruments of Cognition becoming impossible there could be no cognition of anything at all

* That is to say the *Present Time* is indicated not only by the act of *Falling* but also by the existence of things—i.e. by the action of *Being*. This is meant to be an introduction to the following Sūtra.—*Tātparya*

† The actions of *Falling* and the like are such as appear and disappear [so that they do not extend over all present things] but the action of *Being* is one that extends over all present things so that if you deny the *Present* which is indicated by an action (of *Being*) that extends over all things you make Perception impossible and thence every other form of cognition also becomes impossible.—*Tātparya*

‡ Which presupposes the present existence of the Object the Organ and the Contact.—*Bhāṣyaśāstra*

Then again, as a matter of fact, the *Present* Time is actually recognised in two ways,—sometimes it is indicated by the *existence of things* (i.e. by the mere action of *Being*),—as for instance, in the conception 'the Substance exists,'—and sometimes it is indicated by a *series of actions*,—e.g. in such conceptions as 'he is cooking', 'he is cutting',, this 'series of actions' may consist, either in several actions bearing upon a single thing, or in a repetition of the same action (on the same thing), of the former kind is the action spoken of as 'is cooking', which consists of several actions bearing upon the same thing—the action of 'cooking' comprising the actions of *placing the pot upon the oven*, *pouring water into the pot*, *putting rice into it*, *fetching fuel* * *lighting the fire*, *stirring with the ladle*, *straining the gruel*, and *bringing down the pot from the oven*—in the action of 'cutting' on the other hand, we have a repetition of the same action—for a man is said to be 'cutting' wood when he repeatedly raises the axe and lets it fall upon the wood. Now (in both these cases) that which is *being cooked* and that which is *being cut* is that which is *being acted upon* [i.e. connected with an action at the 'present' time]

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Inasmuch as it is only in connection with what is *being done* (being operated upon by an Action) that,—

Sūtra 44

—we have the conceptions of 'has been done' and 'to be done'—it follows that the idea (of the Present) is established in both ways

BHĀṢYA

When the 'series of actions' (comprising *Cooking*) is not yet commenced and is only intended to be done, it is spoken of as 'will cook' which denotes the 'Future' Time,—when the 'series of actions' has ceased and its purpose accomplished, it is spoken of as 'has cooked', which denotes the 'Past' Time,—and lastly, when the 'series of actions' has commenced (and has not ceased), it is spoken of as 'is cooking', which denotes the 'Present' Time. Now of these, that which has ceased is what is

* The fuel fetching and fire-lighting should come first, as they do in the *Īrtika*

spoken of as 'has been done', that which is intended to be done (and not yet commenced) is what is spoken of as 'to be done', and that which is going on (has been commenced and has not ended) is spoken of as 'being done'. Now we find here that the collocation of the three points of time is with reference to a 'series of actions' (of Cooking), and is possible only when it is conceived of as 'present', beingspoken of either as 'is cooking' or as 'is being cooked', wherein what is expressed is the continuity of the series of actions, and not either non-commencement or cessation. This 'Present' is conceived of in both ways—(1) as not mixed up with the notions of Past and Future and (2) as mixed up with them,* that conception of Present which is *unmixed*, we find in such expressions as 'the substance exists' where the *Present* is indicated by the mere *existence* (continuity of the Substance), while such expressions as 'is cooking', 'is cutting' and the like indicate the *Present* as involving all three points, of Time, and as expressing the continuity of a *series of actions*† There are other ways also of this involved use of the Present Tense, met with in ordinary usage,—when for instance, it is used with a view to denote proximity (to Past or Future), and such other ideas‡

From all this the conclusion is that there is such a thing as the 'Present' Time

SECTION 8

Examination of Analogical Cognition

Sūtras 45 49

Sūtra 45

[*Pūrvapakṣa*].—"There can be no Analogy on the basis of either perfect or partial resemblance"—§

* The *Bhāṣya* explains *apatrīkṭah* and *tyapatrīkṭah* as *rahitah* and *śahitah*

† When we say he is cooking some of the actions composing the composite act of cooking have been done while some are being done and some are yet to be done

‡ For examples see *Vārtika*

§ When one perceives the resemblance in the animal before him of the bull and remembers at the same time the advice that 'as is the *śaś'*—so is the *gāyā*',—this perception of resemblance along with the remembrance becomes the means that accomplishes the cognition of the connection of

BHĀṢYA

“(A) There can be no Analogy on the basis of *perfect or absolute resemblance*; for certainly there can be no such conception as ‘as the bull so the bull’ [and this would be the sense of the sentence ‘as the bull so the *gavaya*’, if *perfect resemblance* between the two were meant] (B) Nor can Analogy be based upon *partial resemblance*, for there is no such conception as ‘as the bull so the buffalo’ [and this is what the sentence ‘as the bull so the *gavaya*’ might mean, if the sense conveyed were that of *semi-perfect resemblance*, as the buffalo has many points of resemblance to the bull] (C) Nor lastly can Analogy be based upon *partial or slight resemblance*, for all things cannot be conceived of as resembling one another [and such would be the said Analogy, if it were based upon slight resemblance, for all things are similar in some way or the other]”

Sūtra 46

[*Purvapakṣa answered*].—Inasmuch as Analogy is based upon such resemblance as is actually recognised, there is no room for the objection that has been urged *

the name ‘*gavaya*’ with the animal perceived. So that this recognition of the connection of the name is ‘*Analogical Cognition*’, and the means by which this is brought about has been called Analogy’. This, the *Purvapakṣin* says, is not right, for does the advice upon which the cognition is based—‘as the bull so the *gavaya*’—denote *perfect* resemblance, or *semi-perfect* (almost perfect) resemblance, or only *slight, partial* resemblance? Neither of these is possible

* The exact sense conveyed by a sentence depends upon the context and such other circumstances, so that what particular sort of resemblance is expressed by a certain sentence will be contingent upon these, e.g., when the advisory sentence ‘as the bull so the *gavaya*’, is addressed to a person who knows such animals as the buffalo and the like, it is *semi-perfect resemblance* that is meant, so that when the man sees the *gavaya*, and finds that it has several points of resemblance to the bull, he recognises it as the ‘*Gavaya*’, even though there is similar resemblance between the bull and the buffalo, the man will not recognise the animal as a ‘*buffalo*’, for, as already pointed out, he perfectly knows what a buffalo is, then under the special circumstances of the case, the sentence ‘as the bull so the *gavaya*’, could never be understood to mean ‘as the bull so the buffalo.’—*Tatparya*.

The Sūtra speaks of ‘such resemblance as is recognised’, and the *Paravuddhi* adds that what is meant is that resemblance of which the idea is derived from the particular advisory sentence—e.g. ‘as the bull so the *gavaya*’.

BHĀṢYA

' As a matter of fact, the Analogy (mentioned in the advisory sentence) does not proceed on the basis of either *perfect or semi perfect or slight* resemblance, it proceeds with reference to (i) *e* as indicative, and on the basis of) such resemblance as is actually recognised (from the advisory sentence), and which arises in reference to (i) *e* as indicative of, pointing to) the relation of cause and effect* [between the Analogy and the recognition of the connection of the particular name with the particular thing]† And in a case where these conditions are found to be present Analogy cannot be denied. For this reason the objection that has been urged (in Su 44) is not relevant.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The Purīṣapālāsin says]— In that case, Analogical Cognition may be regarded as purely *inferential*.'

Sūtra 47

' Because it consists in the cognition of what is not perceived by means of what is perceived '

BHĀṢYA

"That is to say just as the cognition of Fire which is not perceived by means of smoke which is perceived is *Inferential*—so the cognition of the unperceived *gavaya* by means of the perceived *bull* should be *inferential*—so that Analogical Cognition does not in any way differ from the Inferential †

* That is the relation subsisting between what is known and what makes it known.—*Bhāṣyaśāstra*

† That is to say there can be no restriction as to any particular sort of resemblance upon which Analogy can be based. What happens is that when one has become cognisant of some sort of resemblance by means of the advisory sentence he comes to recognise the relation of cause and effect, between the *resemblance* and the *cognition of the connection of the particular thing and the particular name*. And what precise sort of resemblance is recognised will depend upon circumstances so that there can be no such restriction as that Analogy is based upon *perfect resemblance only* or on *semi perfect resemblance only* or on *slight resemblance only*—[*Tatparya* and *Parīśuddhi*]

‡ The sentence as the bull so the *gavaya* describes the unperceived *gavaya* through the perceived bull and one who has heard this sentence when he comes to perceive the *gavaya* he does not apprehend anything

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The Siddhāntin answers—*Analogical* Cognition does differ from the *inferential* "By what reasoning do you arrive at this conclusion?" [The answer is given in the Sutra]—

Sūtra 48

In regard to the 'Unperceived' Gavaya we do not find any use for the particular Instrument of Cognition called 'Analogy'

BHĀṢYA

[What actually happens in Analogical Cognition is as follows]—A person who has seen the Bull and has been apprised of the resemblance (between the Bull and the Gavaya) comes to perceive an animal (of unknown name) resembling the Bull, and then arrives at the cognition this is *gavaya* in which he recognises the application of the name *gavaya*—*now* this certainly is not *Inference**

more than what he has learnt from the said sentence even the connection of the name *gavaya* with the particular animal is known only from that sentence so that in analogical cognition the cognition of the perceived bull gives rise to the cognition of the animal bearing the name of *gavaya* which is not perceived. Even though the *gavaya* is actually perceived when the analogical cognition appears yet the animal as bearing the particular name can never be said to be perceived for the application of the name depends entirely upon the advisory sentence so that when the qualifying name is not perceived even though the animal itself is perceived yet as along with the qualification the animal is not perceived. Thus being the cognition of the unperceived by means of the perceived Analogical Cognition is purely inferential. Such is the sense of the *Purāpakṣa*—*Tatparya*

* The species *gavaya* is that to which the name *gavaya* belongs. This is not cognised by means of the sentence as the bull so the *gavaya* all that this sentence expresses is the resemblance to the bull of a certain unknown animal nor does the word *gavaya* as occurring in the sentence denote the said resemblance so that at the time that the sentence is heard the man does not become cognisant of the connection between the name *gavaya* and the unknown animal and what actually happens in analogical cognition is that when the particular animal comes to be actually seen the species to which that animal belongs becomes perceived and thence results the cognition that this animal belongs to the species named '*gavaya*', and this is the operation of 'analogy' which is thus found to operate upon the perceived, and not unperceived *gavaya*—*Tatparya*

[There is a further difference between Analogical and Inferential Cognitions].—Analogy is (propounded) for the sake of another person, that is to say, it is propounded by a person who knows both members (of resemblance), for the benefit of another person to whom one member, the *upameya* (the object that is described as resembling a known thing), is not known*.

Says the *Opponent*,—‘If what you mean is that Analogy is for the benefit of another person, then what you say is not right for as a matter of fact, the cognition arising therefrom belongs to the man himself, certainly, my good Sir, when the man propounds the analogy in the words, ‘as the bull so the *gavaya*’ the cognition produced by it arises in the man himself (just as much as in another person) (so that being for one’s own benefit as well as for that of another person, Analogy is exactly like Inference) ”

We do not deny that the resulting cognition arises in the man also, what we mean is that the propounder’s own cognition is not *analogical*, for ‘Analogy is that which accomplishes what has to be accomplished on the basis of well known resemblance’ (says the *Sūtra*, 1-1 6), and certainly for the man to whom both members of the analogy are well known and as such fully accomplished, there can be no relation (between Analogy and the Cognition) of what is to be accomplished and the means accomplishing it
Further—

Sūtra 49

Inasmuch as Analogy is always stated in the form ‘as—so,’ it cannot be regarded as non different (from Inference)

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, Analogy is always stated in the form ‘as—so’, by means of which the common property (constituting resemblance) is mentioned, so that it cannot be the same as Inference. This also is what constitutes a difference between Analogy and Inference

* उपमेय is the better reading as found in the *Puri Mss*. For *प्रसिद्धोपमेयेन* also the *Puri Mss* read *प्रसिद्धोपमेयेन*, but from what follows | in L. 4 below *प्रसिद्धोपमेयेन* appears to be the better reading

SECTION 8

*Examination of Word (in general).**Sūtra 50-57**Sūtra 50*

[*Pūroapakṣa*].—" 'Word' is 'Inference',—(I) because its objective is such as is amenable to Inference only,—being (as it is) not apprehended (by Perception) "—

BHĀṢYA

(I) " Word is only Inference, and not a separate Instrument of Cognition 'Why so?' Because the objective of (object cognised by means of) Word is such as is amenable to Inference 'How do you know that it can be inferred?' Because it is not apprehended by means of Perception In the case of Inference what happens is that the *Subject*, which is not already apprehended by means of Perception, comes to be cognised afterwards by means of the already known* Probans,—such is the process of Inference,—and in the case of Word, also an object which is not already known (by means of Perception) comes to be cognised afterwards, by means of the already-known Word,—such is the process of verbal cognition Thus we find that 'Word' is only 'Inference' (and Verbal Cognition is purely Inferential) †

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

For the following reason also 'Word' is only 'Inference'—

Sūtra 51

(II) "Because cognitions do not involve two diverse processes"

"When the 'Instruments of Cognition are different from one another, the cognition (brought about by them) involves two distinct processes, for instance, the cognitional process

* 'Perceived'—says *Bhāṣyacandra*

† The Probans put forward in the *Sūtra*, is the fact of the object *not being perceptible*—says the *Vartika* That cognition is called Inferential which apprehends an object not cognisable by Perception, and appears in the wake of Perception (of the Probans in the Inference, of the Word in Verbal Cognition), and a Verbal Cognition fulfills these conditions, it is purely inferential—*Tatparjā*

tation of the Word, where 'word' is in the Possessive case (taking the Genitive case ending), but we do not admit that between them there is any such relation as consists in Contact [or Inference,* and it is only on the basis of some relationship of this latter kind that verbal cognition could be regarded as inferential] " But why is such relation not admitted? " For the simple reason that no such relation can be recognised by means of any Instrument of Cognition† For instance‡ the Contact between the Word and its denotation cannot be recognised by means of Inference, as it is beyond the reach of the sense-organs, that is to say, the object denoted by the Word is beyond the reach of that sense-organ by which the Word itself is apprehended, and [not only this, but] there are also many objects (of verbal cognition) that are absolutely beyond the reach of any sense-organ, and as a matter of fact, only such contact is apprehended by the sense-organs as holds between objects perceptible by the same sense-organ

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Then again if the relation comprehended as between the Word and the thing denoted by it were in the form of 'contact', then (a) either the thing would go over to (come into juxtaposition with) the Word—or (b) the Word would go over to the thing—or (c) both would go over to both. Now in regard to these we find that—

* *Prāptih samyogataṁ ajanyatarah—Bhāṣyaśāstra*

† In both editions of the Vārtika this is printed as a Sūtra. But it is not found either in the Nyāyasūtrabandha or any of the Sūtras Mās.

‡ Why the Bhāṣya selects for attack the relation of contact is thus explained by the Tātparyo—The natural (permanent) relationship between Word and its denotation could be only one of the following kinds—(a) it might be of the nature of identity—or (b) it might consist in the relation of denoter and denoted—that which makes cognisable and that which is cognised—or (c) it might be in the nature of contact. Now that the relation cannot be that of identity we have already shown under §§ 1 1-4 while explaining the term *ajapadeśyare* occurring in the definition of Perception. As for (b) though we admit of this relationship we do not admit it to be eternal as the Mīmāṃsikas hold this we shall show later on (vide Tātparyo P. 201 L. 18 et seq.) So that all that remains to be refuted is the relation of Contact.

Sūtra 54

There can be no such relation [between the Word and its Denotation] also because we do not find (actual) filling, burning and cutting (a) ;

And because the place (of utterance) and the cause (human effort) are not coexistent* (b),—this (additional argument) is what is indicated by the particle 'ca', 'also' in the Sūtra †

[It has been shown that the 'contact' between the Word and the thing denoted by it cannot be cognised by means of Perception]—(a) Nor can it be known by means of Inference that the thing goes over to the Word, for if it did so, it would mean that the thing goes over to the Word, and as the Word is uttered in the mouth‡ and by the effort (subsisting in the Soul of the Man pronouncing the word), there should be filling of the mouth on the utterance of the word 'Food'—burning in the mouth on the utterance of the word 'Fire'—and cutting in the mouth on the utterance of the word 'Sword' [as the things, food, fire and sword, which are denoted by the three words, would, under the theory, go over to the Word, which has appeared in the mouth], as a matter of fact, however, no such effects are perceived, so that, inasmuch as no such effects are produced, the conclusion is that there is no such relation of contact (between the Word and the thing denoted, in the sense that the thing goes over to the Word)

(b) As regards the second alternative—that the Word goes over to the Thing,—if this were so, then no utterance of the Word would be possible, as neither the place (of utterance) nor its cause would be co-existent (at the place where the Thing is),—the 'place' of utterance is the throat and such other parts of the body, and its 'cause' consists of the particular effort of man, and neither of these would subsist where the Thing exists †

* *Parasporosamanadhis-karanyam na sambhavati ityarthoh Bhasyatendra*

† The first alternative (a) is not possible, because of the reason given in the butra, the second alternative (b) is not possible, because of the reason added in the Bhasya, as implied by the particle 'ca'. These reasons are explained by the Bhasya in the next sentence

‡ आस्यस्यान is the right reading supported by all but three Mss and also by the P'artika

† Both—place of utterance and human effort—subsist in the man's body, while the Thing is outside

(c) Lastly, as each of the two alternatives has been found to be untenable individually, it is not possible to accept the third alternative, that both (the Word and the Thing) go over to both.

The conclusion thus is that there can be no 'contact' between the Word and the Thing.

Sūtra 55

[Says the Opponent]—"From the fact of there being a limitation upon the denotation of Words, there can be no denial (of relationship between them)"

BHĀṢYA

"Inasmuch as we see that there is a limitation as to the cognition of certain things arising from certain words, we infer that what causes this limitation is some sort of relationship between the words and the things denoted by them,—for if there were no such determining relation, every word would denote every thing. For this reason there cannot be a denial of the said relationship."

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The answer to the above argument of the Opponent is as follows—

Sūtra 56

The reasoning cannot be accepted, as the cognition of the denotation of a Word is based upon Convention.

As a matter of fact, the restriction that we find in connection with the denotation of words is due, not to any (eternal) relation between them, but to Convention. When we said on a previous occasion (*Vide above*) that we do admit that there is such relation between them as is expressed by the assertion 'such is the denotation of this Word', where Word is in the Possessive case,—what we referred to was this Convention "But what is this Convention?" 'Convention' is the ordinance restricting the denotation of words by such injunctions as 'such and such a thing is to be denoted by such and such a word'. And as a matter of fact, it is only when this ordinance is known that there arises any cognition from the use of a word, while if the ordinance is not known, even though the word is heard pronounced, it does not give rise to any Cognition.

(it expresses nothing) This fact (that verbal cognition arises only when one knows that 'such and such a thing is denoted by such and such a word') cannot be denied by even one who holds that there is an (eternal) relationship between the Word and the thing denoted by it. Ordinary men come to recognise this Convention (which is the ordinance of God) hearing upon words by observing their use in common parlance*, and it is for the preserving of this God-made Convention that we have the science of Grammar, which explains and determines that form of speech which consists of *single Words*—[by showing that a word can be regarded as *correct* only when used in the form and in the sense imparted to it by God, when propounding the ordinance and thereby fixing the Convention upon that word,—and it is *incorrect* when used in another form or another sense], and of that form of speech which consists of *sentences*, the only explanation or definition possible is that it is 'such collection of connected Words as expresses one complete idea'

Thus we conclude that, even though the Word is denotative, there is not the slightest reason† (or use) for the inferring of any (permanent) relationship in the form of *Contact* ‡

Sūtra 57

Also because there is no such limitation (in actual usage) among different people §

* The *Bhāṣya* explains प्रयुज्यमान as निवृज्यमान, 'the person to whom a direction is addressed' the sentence according to this, would mean—'the relationship is recognised by watching the action of the man to whom the verbal direction is addressed'

† Both Purī Mss. and the *Bhāṣya* read अर्थबुद्धौऽपि, which gives good sense 'not the slightest tittle of reason or use' while अर्थबुद्धौऽपि can be made to give some sense only by a forced construction. The *Bhāṣya* explains 'अर्थ' as प्रयोजन, *purpose, use*.

‡ Such being the case, inasmuch as there is no natural relationship between the Word and its denotation it is not right for the Opponent to urge such relationship with a view to identify Word with Inference which is based upon the natural relationship between the Probans and the Probandum —*Tuṣṭyā*.

§ It is noteworthy that the word 'jātis' here stands for *people* and not *caste*, as the *Bhāṣya* paraphrases the term as referring to Rāis, Āryas and Mlechhas.

BHĀṢYA

[Because there is diversity in actual usage among diverse people,] the denotation of things by words must be regarded as *based upon convention*, and not upon any natural relationship. As a matter of fact, we find that among such diverse people as Sages, Āryas and Mlecchhas, they make use of words for expressing things in any way they choose (without any restriction) and if there were any natural relationship between Words and their denotations, no such arbitrary usage would be possible, for instance, in the case of the *light* of fire, we find that its capability of being the cause of making colour cognised (where the relationship is natural and eternal), does not fail among any particular people at all.*

SECTION 10

On 'Word' in Particular [i.e. Scripture]

Sūtras 58-69

[*Purvopakṣa*].—"In the Scriptural texts dealing respectively with—(a) the *Putrakama* *Isti* (the sacrifice laid down for the purpose of obtaining a son) (b) the *Havana* (oblations) and (c) *Repetitions*—

Sūtra 58

"That (Word) cannot be regarded as an Instrument of Right Cognition because of such defects as (A) Falsity, (B) Contradiction and (C) Tautology."

BHĀṢYA

The pronoun 'that' in the Sūtra is meant by the revered author of the Sūtra to refer to a particular kind of Word.

Word cannot be regarded as an Instrument of Right Cognition (i.e. trustworthy) Why?

* (a) The word *yava* is used by the Āryas to express barley and by the Mlecchas to express long pepper. (b) the word *trist* is used by Rsis in the sense of nine hymns and the Āryas used it in the sense of a particular creeper. Such diversity of usage could not be possible if there were a natural relationship between Words and their denotations. For Light which bears a natural relation to the illumining of things and rendering colour cognisable cannot be made to be connected with Taste or Odour by even thousands of artists. This diversity of usage in the case of Words can be explained only on the basis of Convention which can vary among different peoples.—*Pāṭanjali*

(A) Because of the defect of *Falsity*—as found in the case of the text dealing with the *Putrakāma* Sacrifice. The text declares that, 'One who desires a son should perform the *Putresti*, and yet we find that even when the Sacrifice has been finished, no son is born; and thus finding a text laying down something for a visible purpose to be false, we naturally conclude that other texts,—which deal with acts for invisible (transcendental) purposes—such texts, for instance, as 'One should perform the *Agnihotra* (for the purpose of attaining heaven)'—are also false.

(B) Secondly, because we find the defect of *Contradiction* (by one text) of what has been enjoined (by another). For instance, in regard to the (*Agnihotra*) Oblation, we find such injunctions as—(a) 'The oblation should be offered *after sunrise*', (b) 'The oblation should be offered *before sunrise*', (c) 'the oblation should be offered at a time when the stars have ceased to be visible and the sun has not become visible',—and after having laid down these points of time, other texts go on to say—(a) 'If one offers the oblations *after sunrise*, the oblations are eaten up by *Shabala* (the Dog of variegated colour)', and (c) 'if one offers the oblations at the time when the stars have set and the sun has not risen, the oblations are eaten up by both *Śyava* and *Śabala*',—and as there is apparent contradiction among these (pairs of) texts, one or the other must be *false*.

(C) Lastly, because we find the defect of *tautology*, in those texts that lay down repetition, in the text—'One should repeat three times the first verse, and three times the final verse', we find the defect of tautology, and certainly a tautological assertion can proceed only from a demented person.

From all this the conclusion is that Word is not an Instrument of Right Cognition (i.e. it is not *trustworthy*), as it is beset with such defects as 'falsity, contradiction and tautology'.

Sūtra 59

Siddhānta—(A) Not so, as the failure is due to deficiencies in the Action, the Agent and the Means.

BHĀṢYA

The text bearing upon the *Putresti* cannot be regarded as 'false'. "Why?" Because the failure is due to deficiencies in the

Action, the Agent and the Means (What the text declares is that) the parents, becoming connected with the particular sacrifice (by performing it), give birth to a son, so that the sacrifice is the *instrument*, the 'means',—the *parents* are the 'Agents', and their connection with the sacrifice is the 'Action', and the son is born when all these three are perfect, but when they are not perfect, no son is born

In regard to the Sacrifice itself, there is 'deficiency' in the *action*, when there is non-performance or omission of its details,—there is 'deficiency' in the *agent* when the performer happens to be illiterate and of immoral character, there is 'deficiency' in the *means* (a) when the material offered is not duly sanctified or has been desecrated, (b) when the mantras recited are shorter or longer (than their correct forms) or devoid of proper accent or the necessary syllables, or (c) when the sacrificial fee is such as has been acquired by unfair means, or is too small, or consists of deprecated material

In regard to the act of procreation itself, there is 'deficiency' in the *act* when the method of intercourse is wrong,—there is 'deficiency' in the *agent* when there are uterine diseases (preventing conception) or defective semen, and 'deficiency' in the *means*, has been described in connection with the Sacrifice

In regard to ordinary actions of the world, we have the injunction, 'Desiring fire one should rub together two pieces of wood' and in connection with this, there is 'deficiency' in the *act* when the rubbing is done in the wrong manner,—there is 'deficiency' in the *agent* when there is some remissness in his knowledge or in his effort, and there is 'deficiency' in the *means* when the wood is wet and with holes (worm-eaten)

Now, when there are these deficiencies, the result is not achieved, but that does not make the said injunction ('Desiring fire one should rub together two pieces of wood') *false* as when everything is perfect, the result does become accomplished. And in no way does the case of the injunction (of the Vedic sacrifice)—'Desiring son one should perform the Putreṣṣu'—differ from the said injunction (of the worldly act of rubbing the wood pieces for obtaining fire)

Sūtra 60

(B)—The deprecatory assertion applies to the changing of a particular time after having (once) adopted it,—

BHĀṢYA

'So that there is no *contradiction* in texts bearing upon the Agnihotra oblations'—this has to be supplied to the Sūtra (in order to complete the sentence) The deprecatory text—'When a man offers the oblations after sunrise, they are eaten up by the Śyava dog'—is meant to point out that it is not right to change the time that has been once adopted, as is done when a person, having in the first instance made the offerings at one time (e g. *before* sunrise), changes it subsequently and makes them at another time (e g. *after* sunrise) So that the text only serves to deprecate the *abandoning of the enjoined procedure* (and there is no 'contradiction' in this)

Sūtra 61

(C)—It may be rightly regarded as a useful reiteration

BHĀṢYA

What is referred to in this Sūtra is the Purvapakṣa argument that the Veda is tainted with 'tautology' by reason of the repetitions that it lays down (Su. 58) (It has to be borne in mind, however, that) it is only *needless* repetition that constitutes 'tautology', there is, however, repetition with a *purpose*, which is called 'anuvāda', 'Reiteration' Now, the repetition that is laid down in the Vedic text 'One should recite the first verse thrice and the final verse also thrice'—is of the latter kind, 'Reiteration', as it is done *with a purpose*, the purpose being that by repeating the first and final verses thrice each, the number of the *Sāmidhēni* verses becomes *fifteen*, and it is with reference to this that we have the following description of the 'mantra' (the 'kindling' verses)—'By means of this verbal thunderbolt with its *fifteen* spokes I attack my enemy who hates me and whom I hate', where the name 'mantra thunderbolt' refers to the *fifteen* 'Sāmidhēni' verses, and this number 'fifteen' could not be obtained without the aforesaid repetition (of the first and final verses) (the actual number of verses being only eleven)

Sūtra 62

Specially as a classification of the texts is accepted on the basis of (diversity in their) purpose

BHĀṢYA

(As a classification of the texts is accepted on the basis of diversity in their purpose, therefore) Vedic texts must be regarded as 'instruments of right cognition', just as is done in common parlance (where every word serving a useful purpose is accepted as an instrument of Right Cognition)

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The 'classification' of Vedic Brāhmaṇa texts is three fold, as follows —

Sūtra 63

The texts being employed as (A) Injunctions', (B) 'Descriptions' and (C) 'Reiterations with a Purpose'

Vedic texts are employed in three ways—(A) as 'injunctive', (B) as 'descriptive' and (C) as 'reiterative',—assertions

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Of these three—

Sūtra 64

The injunction is that which prescribes (a certain act)

BHĀṢYA

That text which *prescribes*—i.e. urges or incites (the Agent to activity)—is called 'Injunction' and this Injunction is either mandatory or permissive, e.g. such texts as 'One desiring heaven should offer the Agnihotra oblations'

Sūtra 65

The Descriptions are—Valedictory, Deprecatory, Illustrative and Narrative

BHĀṢYA

(a) That text which eulogises a certain Injunction by describing the (desirable) results (following from the enjoined act) is called 'Valedictory', such a text serves two purposes (1) it serves the purpose of inspiring confidence, whereby the agent comes to have faith in what is thus eulogised (and is thereby led to perform it) (2) it also serves the purpose of persuading whereby on knowing the result following from a certain

act, the agent is persuaded to do it, e.g. such texts as—'As the gods cognised all beings by means of the Sarvaṃ sacrifice, this sacrifice accomplishes the purpose of cognising all beings and obtaining all things, by means of this a man obtains all things and conquers all beings' &c, &c

(b) The text that describes the undesirable results (following from the act enjoined) is called 'deprecatory', it serves the purpose of dissuasion, whereby the agent may not do the act deprecated, e.g. such texts as—'That which is known as the Jyotistoma is the foremost of all sacrifices, one who, without performing this, performs another sacrifice, falls into a pit, the act perishes and the man is destroyed', and so forth

(c) That text which describes a contrary (different) method of action adopted by a certain person is called 'illustrative', e.g. such texts as—'Having offered the oblation, people pour out the fat, and then the mixture of ghee and coagulated milk, but the Caraka priests pour this mixture first and they say that this mixture constitutes the very life of Agni, and so forth

(d) The text that describes a method as adopted traditionally is called 'narrative', e.g., such texts as—'Thus it is that Brāhmanas have adopted, in their hymns the Bahispavamāna jama, thinking that in so doing they were performing the sacrifice in its very womb', and so forth

"Why should the illustrative and Narrative texts be regarded as 'Descriptive' (and not 'Injunctive')?"

These are regarded as 'Descriptive', firstly because they are connected with *praise or deprecation*, and secondly because they indicate something connected with (bearing upon) some other Injunction (to which, therefore, they are supplementary)

Sūtra 66

(C) When the Injunction and the Enjoined are mentioned again, it constitutes 'Reiteration (with a purpose)'

BHĀṢYA

The compound '*vidhivihitānuvācana*' means the '*anuvācana*', re-mention, of (a) the '*vidhi*', Injunction and (b) the '*vihitā*', Enjoined,—the former being verbal 'reiteration', and the latter material 'reiteration', so that just as there are two

kinds of 'Repetition' so are there two kinds of 'Reiteration' also

"Why should the *enjoined* be 'reiterated'?"

It is reiterated for the purpose of *reference*, it is in reference to what is *enjoined* that we have either (a) praise (of the act) or (b) deprecation (of the omitting of the act), or (c) a supplementary detail is laid down, and (d) some times Reiteration is for the purpose of indicating the sequence between two enjoined acts, and so on other purposes may be found out

In common parlance also, we have three kinds of assertions—*injunctive*, *descriptive* and *reiterative* (a) 'One should cook rice' is an *injunction*, (b) 'Long life, glory, strength, pleasure intelligence—all this resides in food' is a *description* (of the food whose cooking has been enjoined), (c) we have the 'reiteration' (of the enjoined cooking) in the following forms 'cook, cook, please', where we have repetition, 'cook quickly', 'do please cook', in the form of entreaty, and 'you must cook', for the purpose of emphasising

Thus then, as in the case of ordinary assertions, Words are accepted as 'Instruments of Right Cognition', when it is found that they are classified according to the diverse purposes served by them,—exactly in the same manner, inasmuch as Vedic texts also are capable of being classified according to the different purposes served by them, they may be regarded as 'Instruments of Right Cognition' (as pointed out above, under Su 63)

Sūtra 67

(The Opponent says)—"There is no difference between 'Reiteration' and 'Repetition', as both consist in the restating of the same word"

BHĀṢYA

"As a matter of fact, no distinction is possible as that 'Repetition' is *wrong* and 'Reiteration' *right*. Because in both cases a word, whose meaning has been already comprehended, is repeated, so that by reason of the same word being repeated both are equally *wrong*"

Sūtra 68

(Answer)—(Reiteration is) not the same (as Repetition), as (in the former) the re-mention (of the word) is like the exhortation to go 'more quickly'

BHĀṢYA

'Reiteration' cannot be regarded as the same as 'Repetition',—Why?—because when the re mention of a word serves a useful purpose, then it is 'Reiteration', so that even though in 'Repetition' also we have the re mention of words, the re mention in this case is entirely useless, while 'Reiteration', serving a useful purpose, is *like the exhortation to go 'more quickly'* that is to say, when one is exhorted in the words 'go quickly, quickly', the meaning is 'go more quickly', so that the re mention (of the word 'quickly') serves the purpose of indicating a peculiarity in the act (of *going*, which purpose could not be accomplished by the single mention of the word 'quickly') This exhortation is cited only as an instance, there are several other instances of re mention with a purpose, e.g. when it is said 'he cooks and cooks', what is meant is that the act of cooking is unceasing, 'village upon village is pleasant' means that every village is pleasant, 'God rained round and round the Trigarta country (the modern Jullundhur) means *exception* (that rainfall avoided that country), 'Seated near and about the Wall' means *proximity*, 'there are bitters and bitters' means that there are several kinds of bitterness

Thus then, we conclude that Reiteration is meant to be a *reference*, for the purpose of praising or deprecating or laying down a supplementary detail or pointing out the sequence of what has been enjoined (as explained under Su 66)

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Question—"Does then the trustworthiness of Word (Scripture) become established simply by setting aside the arguments against its trust-worthiness"?—

Answer—It becomes established also by the following positive argument —

Sūtra 69

⌋ The Trustworthiness of the Word (of the Veda) is based upon the trustworthiness of the reliable (veracious) expositor, just like the trustworthiness of Incantations and of Medical Scriptures

BHĀṢYA

"In what does the trustworthiness of the Medical Scriptures consist?"

It consists in this fact that, when the Medical Scriptures declare that 'by doing this and this one obtains what he desires, and by avoiding this and this he escapes from what is undesirable'—and a person acts accordingly,—the result turns out to be exactly as asserted, and this shows that the said Scriptures are true, not wrong, in what they assert

In the case of *Incantations* also it is found that whenever they are used for the purpose of averting such evils as poison, ghosts and thunderbolt, they are found effective, in bringing about that result, and this fact establishes the 'trustworthiness' of the Incantations

"But to what is all this *trustworthiness* due?"

It is due to the trustworthiness of the veracious expositor

"And in what does the trustworthiness of veracious expositors consist?"

It consists in the following facts—that they have a direct cognition of the real essence of things—they have compassion on living beings,—and they are desirous of describing things as they really exist. As a matter of fact, veracious persons (a) have a direct perception of the real essence of things,—that is, they know that such and such a thing should be avoided by man, and also the method of avoiding it,—that such and such a thing should be acquired by man, and also the method of acquiring it,—(b) they take compassion on living beings,—that is, they feel as follows—'These poor creatures being by themselves ignorant, there is no other means, save instruction, available to them for knowing things, until they know, they cannot either perform or avoid any acts, and unless they do perform acts, it cannot be well with them, and there is no one (save myself) who would help them in this matter,—so, well, I am going to instruct them about things as they exist and as I know them, having listened to these instructions, these creatures will understand things, and thereby they shall avoid what should be avoided and take up only what should be taken up'. It is on this basis that the instruction of veracious persons proceeds, and when an act is known on

this threefold authority of the Veracious Expositor, and is performed accordingly, it actually accomplishes the purpose (it is meant to accomplish) From this it follows that the instruction of veracious persons is trustworthy, and this leads to the veracious expositors themselves being regarded as trustworthy

Thus (trustworthiness having been found in) the instruction of the Veracious Expositor, in the form of the Medical Scriptures (that part of the Veda which treats of the Medical Science,) which deal with visible things,—from this we infer the trustworthiness of those parts of the Veda also which deal with invisible (transcendental) things as the ground of trustworthiness—which consists in the trustworthiness of the Veracious Expositor—is equally present in both In fact some texts of the latter section of the Veda also are found to deal with visible things e.g., the text 'One desiring to acquire a village should perform sacrifices', and on seeing this coming out true, we can infer, from this also, the trustworthiness of the other Vedic texts (dealing with purely invisible things)

In ordinary worldly matters also a large amount of business is carried on on the basis of the assertions of veracious persons, and here also the trustworthiness of the ordinary veracious expositor is based upon the same three conditions—he has full knowledge of what he is saying he has sympathy for others (who listen to him) and he has the desire to expound things as they really exist,—and on the basis of these the assertion of the veracious expositor is regarded as trustworthy

The inference (of the trustworthiness of all Vedic texts, from that of the medical texts) proceeds on the basis of the seer and expositor being the same (in both cases) That is to say, the omniscient Expositor and the Seers are the same veracious persons in the case of the Vedic texts and that of the Medical Scriptures, so that from the trustworthiness of the latter we can infer that of the latter also

(The Mimamsaka objects)—'Inasmuch as the trustworthiness of Vedic texts is due to their eternality, it is not right to say that their trustworthiness is due to the trustworthiness of the Veracious Expositor'

(D) 'Antithesis' is contrast, as between what *exists* and what does *not exist*, (we have this as a Means of Cognition) when the *non-existent* action of *raining* brings about the cognition of the *existence* of the connection of the clouds with high winds, as it is only when there is some such obstruction, as the connection of the cloud with high winds, that there is no *falling* of the rain drops, which would otherwise be there by reason of the force of gravity in the drops "

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

(The answer to the above Purvapakṣa is that) it is quite true that Tradition and the rest are 'Means of Cognition', but it does not follow that they are distinct Means of Cognition, (quite apart from those enumerated in Su 1-1-3) In fact the denial (in the foregoing Sutra) of the four foldness of Instruments of Cognition is based upon the assumption that Tradition and the rest are distinct (from Perception &c),—and this

Sutra 2

is not a correct denial, as 'Tradition' is not different from Word, and 'Presumption', 'Deduction' and Antithesis are not different from 'Inference'

BHĀṢYA

The said denial of four foldness cannot be right. Why? 'Word' having been defined as 'the assertion of a reliable person,' this definition does not fail to include 'Tradition' so that the *difference* (between the two, which the opponent relies upon) is found to be engulfed in non-difference. Then again, 'Inference' consists in the cognising, through the perceptible, of the imperceptible related to it, and precisely the same is the case also with 'Presumption', 'Deduction' and 'Antithesis'. What happens in the case of 'Presumption' is that—on our cognising what is asserted by a certain sentence, there arises the cognition of what is not asserted by it—this cognition being due to the relation of 'opposition', (negative concomitance) subsisting between what is asserted and what is not asserted and this is only a case of 'Inference'. Similarly what happens in the case of 'Deduction' is that the Composite and the Component being related to each other by the relation of invariable concomitance, the cognition of the former gives rise to the cognition of the

latter, and this is only a case of Inference'. Lastly, (what happens in the case of 'Antithesis' is that) it being found that of two things, while one is present the other cannot be present,—and thus the two being recognised as *contraries*,—if it is found that a certain effect does not come about (even when the necessary cause is there), we conclude that there must be something obstructing the cause (this something being what is *contrary* to the effect) and this is pure 'Inference'

Thus we conclude that the said division of the Means of Cognition (into *four*) is quite right

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

(Says the opponent)— It has been asserted (in the Bhasya) *that it is true that Tradition and the rest are Means of Cognition but it does not follow that they are distinct Means of Cognition.*—now this admits that Tradition &c are real means of Cognition but this admission is not right because—

Sūtra 3

"Presumption cannot be a true Means of Cognition as it is uncertain (not always true)"

BHĀṢYA

'From the assertion—'there is no rain when there are no clouds'—it is presumed that there is rain when there are clouds as a matter of fact however, sometimes it happens that even though clouds are present there is no rain so that Presumption is not always a true Means of Right Cognition

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

(Our answer to the above objection is as follows)—There is no uncertainty attaching to Presumption —

Sūtra 4

It is on account of what is not Presumption being regarded as Presumption (that there arises the idea of its being not always true)

BHĀṢYA

(What the particular instance of Presumption cited is meant to indicate is the general principle that) from the assertion that 'when the cause is absent the effect is not produced', we presume its obverse that 'when the cause is present the effect is produced', existence being the obverse of non-existence, and certainly this

presumption of the production of the effect when the cause is present is never found to fail in any single case of the presence of the cause, that is, there is not a single case in which the effect is produced when the cause is not present, so that Presumption cannot be regarded as uncertain or *not always true*. As for a certain contingency under which, even when the cause (clouds) is present, the effect (rain) does not appear, by reason of the causal operation being obstructed by something (high winds, for instance) — this is a characteristic of all causes, and this is not what forms the subject of Presumption. "What is it that forms its subject?" The principle that 'the effect is produced when the cause is present', i. e., that the production of the effect is never unconcomitant with the presence of the cause, — this is what forms the subject of Presumption. Such being the fact, it is clear that when the Opponent denies the truth of Presumption he regards as Presumption what is not real Presumption. The characteristic of all causes (mentioned above) is what is actually seen, and hence cannot be denied.

Sūtra 5

Further, the denial itself is invalid, — being uncertain (not universally true)

BHĀṢYA

The denial (by the Opponent) is in the form of the sentence 'Presumption cannot be a true Means of Cognition, as it is uncertain' (Su 3), and what this denies is only the fact of Presumption being a true Means of Cognition, it does not deny the existence of Presumption, and as such this denial itself becomes 'uncertain', being 'uncertain', it is invalid, and being invalid, it cannot serve the purpose of (rightly) denying any thing.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

You might argue as follows — 'Particular assertions relate to only certain subjects, and their 'certainty' or 'uncertainty' also can be in relation to those particular subjects only, and in the case in question the mere existence (of Presumption) is not the subject of our denial (hence any 'uncertainty' relating to that existence cannot affect the validity of our denial'.

To this our answer would be as follows —

Sūtra 6

If the denial is valid, there can be no invalidity in Presumption.

BHĀṢYA

Of Presumption also what forms the subject is the fact that 'the appearance of the effect is never inconcomitant with the existence of the cause', and not that the said concomitance is a character of the cause (i.e., it does not mean that whenever the cause is present, the effect *must appear*), because as a matter of fact the cause does *not* produce the effect when there is an obstacle to its operation

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

(Having failed in regard to Presumption, the Opponent next directs his attack against the validity of 'Antithesis')—"Well, then, what you have said (Bhāṣya) admits the validity of 'Antithesis' as a Means of (Cognition), and this is not right. Why? Because—

Sūtra 7

"Antithesis cannot be regarded as a valid Means of Cognition as there is nothing that can be the object of cognition by its means"

BHĀṢYA

(Our answer to this is as follows)—As a matter of fact there are many things that are found in ordinary experience, to be the objects of Cognition by means of 'Antithesis', and in view of this fact, it is through sheer audacity that you make the assertion that "Antithesis cannot be regarded as valid Means of Cognition, as there is nothing that can be the object of cognition by its means"

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Of the vast number of things (cognised by means of Antithesis), a portion is exemplified —

Sūtra 8

Certain things being marked, those not marked, being characterised by the absence of that mark, come to be regarded as the object of cognition by the said means (of Antithesis)

BHĀṢYA

That is to say, there are things that actually become the objects of cognition by means of 'Antithesis' or 'Negation' "How so?" When certain things,—some pieces of cloth, which are indicated as not required—are marked, those (pieces of cloth) that are indicated as required and are not similarly marked are characterised by the absence of that mark; i.e., they are recognised by the absence of that mark. So that when both (the marked and the unmarked pieces) are present, and a man is asked to 'bring the unmarked pieces of cloth', he recognises the unmarked pieces by the *absence* of the mark in them, and having recognised them, he brings them. And a 'Means of Cognition' is only that which brings about cognition [so that, as bringing about the 'cognition' of the required pieces of cloth, the *negation* of marks must be regarded as a Means of Cognition]

Sūtra 9

If it be urged that—"When the thing is non-existent there can be no Antithesis (or negation) of it",—our answer is that this is not right, as it is possible for the thing to exist elsewhere

BHĀṢYA

(The Opponent says)—"Where a certain thing, having existed, ceases to exist, there alone its antithesis is possible, in the case of the unmarked cloth pieces, however, (where the marks have never existed), the marks have not ceased to exist *after having existed there*, so that any antithesis of the marks is not possible in this case"

Our answer to this is that *this is not right, as it is possible for the thing to exist elsewhere*. That is to say, what happens is that the man (asked to bring the unmarked cloths) sees the presence of marks in certain pieces, and does not perceive it in others,—so that perceiving the absence (antithesis, 'previous negation', *non-appearance*) of the marks in these latter, he cognises, by means of this antithesis, the thing required (i.e., the *unmarked cloths*)

Sūtra 10

(Says the Opponent)—"The presence of the mark (in the unmarked things) cannot be the means (of any cognition) in regard to the unmarked things"

BHĀṢYA

"The presence of the marks is in the *marked* cloths; and the Antithesis is not of these marks; in fact the Antithesis of those marks present in the marked cloths is in the *unmarked* cloths, and this Antithesis cannot be the means (of a cognition) Those that are present, to speak of the Antithesis of those would involve contradiction in terms "

Sūtra 11

This is not right, as the possibility of the cognition is in view of the actual presence of the marks (elsewhere)

BHĀṢYA

We do not say that there is antithesis (absence, non-existence) of those marks that are present (in that same thing where the antithesis is conceived of), what we say is that the marks being present in some and not present in other things, when a person, looking for the marks, does not find them present in these latter things, these things he comes to recognise by means of that *absence* (antithesis) of the marks (So that the absence becomes the means of the cognition of those things)

Sūtra 12

Then again, the antithesis of a thing is possible before it comes into existence

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, there are two kinds of Antithesis, one consisting in the non-existence of the thing before it has come into existence, and another consisting in its non-existence after having come into existence, due to its destruction,—now the 'Antithesis' of the marks that there is in the *unmarked* things is that of the former kind,—that consisting in their non existence before they have come into existence, and not of the other kind (so that the objection urged in Su 9 does not lie with our view at all)

SECTION (2)

Non-Eternality of Words

Sūtras (13-38)

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Sūtra 1-1-7 says '*āptopadeśah śabdah*', 'Word is the assertion of a reliable person,' meaning that it is only Sound of a

particular kind that can be the Means of Right Cognition, which implies that there are several kinds of 'Śabda, Sound.' Now in regard to all this 'Śabda, Sound', in general, we proceed to consider whether it is eternal or non-eternal

On this point Doubt arises, on account of there being a difference of opinion caused by such reasons being adduced as tend to produce uncertainty (in men's minds)

(The following are the different opinions that have been held on this point) —(1) "Sound is a quality of Ākāśa, it is all pervading and eternal, and it is liable to manifestation only" (The Old Mīmāṃsaka view)—(2) "Sound lies latent in (five) Substances, along with, and in the same manner as, Odour and other qualities, and is liable to manifestation only" (The Sāṅkhya view)—(3) "Sound is the quality of Ākāśa liable to production and destruction" (The Vaiśeṣika view)—(4) "Sound is produced by disturbance in the basic elemental Substances, it does not subsist in anything, it is liable to production and also to destruction" (The Bauddha view)

In view of this diversity of opinion, there arises a doubt as to what is the real truth

Our answer is that Sound is non-eternal! 'Why?'

Sūtra 13

(A) Because it has a cause,—(B) Because it is apprehended through a sense-organ,—and (C) because it is (conceived and) spoken of as a product.

BHĀṢYA

(A) The term 'ādi' in the Sūtra stands for cause,—the etymological signification of the term being 'that wherefrom a certain thing is drawn out or produced', 'ādiyatē asmat' As a matter of fact, it is found that what has a cause is non-eternal,—so that as Sound is produced by conjunction or disjunction—and as such has a cause—it must be non-eternal "What is the meaning of the assertion that Sound has a cause?" The meaning simply is that, inasmuch as Sound is liable to origination (to be produced or brought into existence), it is non-eternal,—that is, after having come into existence, it ceases to exist, that is, it is liable to destruction

belongs to the manifesting Impact, from that arises the acute-ness or dullness of the apprehension of the manifested Sound and there is no difference in the Sound itself, just as in the case of Colour, (the Colour remaining the same), its apprehension is heightened (rendered more acute) or lowered (rendered dull) by the light that manifests it"—But this cannot be, as there is suppression (in the case of Sound), that is to say, it is only when the Sound of the drum is acute that it suppresses the duller Sound of the lute, and not when it has been deadened and dull (this well known fact cannot be explained on the hypothesis of the opponent, for) the suppression could not be done by the apprehension of the Sound, and as for the Sound itself, it is the same in both cases (according to the Opponent, whether the Sound of the Drum is acute or dull, it is the same Sound that has continued all along and hence dull or acute, it should always suppress the sound of the lute), if, on the other hand, the Sound in the two cases be regarded as different the said phenomenon of suppression becomes quite explicable. From this it follows that Sound is *produced*, not *manifested*. Then again, (according to him) the Sound being manifested in the same place as their manifesters, there could be no contact (between the two and hence no suppression of the one by the other), so that according to the view that Sound is manifested in the same place as its manifesters, no suppression would be possible, as the Sound of the lute (which is manifested in the lute) cannot be got at by the Sound of the Drum (which is manifested in the Drum). If it be urged that there could be suppression even without the one getting at the other,—then (our answer would be that) in that case there would be suppression of all Sounds. The Opponent might think that—"even though one Sound is not got at by another there could be suppression",—but if this could be possible, then just as the drum-Sound suppresses one lute-Sound—*i.e.* that which has its manifesters near the manifesters of the drum-Sound—so would it suppress all lute-Sounds,—even those whose manifesters would be at a distance from the Drum, as the condition of *not being in contact* with the drum Sound would be the same in the case of all lute-Sounds, so that when a Drum would be sounded at any one place, it should render inaudible the Sound of all the lutes that might be sounded at the time anywhere in all

regions of the world¹ On the other hand, (according to our view), the Series of Sounds (produced in each case) being distinct, it becomes possible for only a certain Dull Sound to be suppressed by a certain Acute Sound,—this being dependent upon their reaching the auditory organ at the same time ‘What is it that you call *suppression*?’ The *suppression* of a thing consists in its being not apprehended, by reason of the apprehension of a similar thing as for instance, the light of the torch,—which would be (otherwise) visible,—is suppressed by the light of the sun (so that there is suppression of one Sound by another when being otherwise audible, it is rendered inaudible by another sound)

Sūtra 14

[Objection]—“(A) Because the destruction of the Jar is eternal, (B) because Community is eternal,—and (C) because even eternal things are conceived and spoken of as non eternal [what has been urged in the preceding Sūtra cannot be accepted as conclusive]’

BHĀṢYA

“(A) Sound cannot be regarded as non eternal on the ground of its *having a cause* (as urged in Su 13) Why? Because the premiss (upon which that reasoning is based) is not universally true In the case of the destruction of the Jar we find that even though it has a cause (and a beginning) yet it is *eternal* [Hence the premiss that ‘all that has cause is non-eternal’ is not true] ‘But how do you know that the destruction of the Jar’ has a cause? [We know this from the fact that] the Jar ceases to exist only when there is a disruption of its (component) causes (in the shape of the clay-particles making up the Jar) But how do you know that this *destruction of the Jar* is eternal [That we infer from the fact that] when the Jar has once ceased to exist on the disruption of its component causes, this non existence of that particular Jar is never again set aside by its existence [i.e. the Jar that has once been destroyed never comes into existence again]

“(B) The second reason urged as proving the non eternality of Sound is that *it is apprehended through a sense-organ* But here also the premiss is not true, as we find that *Community*, though eternal, is yet apprehended through sense-organs

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

As regards the argument of the Opponent (urged in Su 14) that Community is eternal (and yet perceptible by the Senses) — when we urge the *sense perceptibility* of Sound as proving its non-eternality, what we mean is that it is apprehended through sense contact and—

Sūtra 16

—inasmuch as this is urged only as leading to the inference of the series (of Sounds) —

BHĀṢYA

the premisses are not untrue in their bearing upon eternal things —this much has to be brought in from what has gone before *

We do not mean that Sound is non-eternal simply by reason of its being apprehended by the senses what we do mean is that the fact of Sound being apprehended through sense contact leads to the inference that in every phenomenon of Sound there is a series of Sounds, and this fact of there being a series of several Sounds (appearing one after the other) proves that each of these Sounds is *non-eternal*

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The second argument urged by the Opponent (in Su 14) is that even eternal things are conceived and spoken of as non-eternal Now this also is not right

Sūtra 17

Because what the term *part* really denotes is the constituent cause —†

* The printed text (Benares) reads *नित्ये व्याभिचार इति प्रकृतम्* The right reading is supplied by the *Bhāṣyatandra*—*नित्येष्वव्यभिचार इति प्रकृतम्*; it explains *प्रकृत* as *अव्युत्तम्* It calls these words as *पूरक*, completing the Sūtra

† In the printed text (Benares) the text of the Sūtra is lengthened by the expression *नित्येष्वव्यभिचार* . But this expression does not appear in the body of the Sūtra itself either in the *Nyayasūtrasamibandha* or in the *Purī Sūtra MS* or in *Sūtra MS B* The *Tatparya* also quotes this Sūtra (on p. 317) as ending with *धानात्*. We have therefore taken *नित्येष्वव्यभिचार* as the opening words of the *Bhāṣya* on the *Sūtra* The *Bhāṣyatandra* also calls these words supplementary to the Sūtra

* *dalness*, that can belong only to a non-eternal thing, are such as have been proved above to belong to Sound in reality, and not attributed to it merely figuratively [Hence our original reasoning remains unshaken]

"But how is it that we do not know of any Sūtrā of Gautama's to this effect [(1) that *Ākāśa* and Soul cannot have *parts*, in the real sense of the term, and (2) that Sound appears in a series]?"

Well, it is in the nature of the revered Gautama, that in many sections (he does not actually assert and prove certain facts),* so that in the present connection also he does not actually assert and prove the said two facts, and the reason is that he thinks that the student will be able to learn these truths from the doctrine of the *S'āstra*—this '*Śāstra*-doctrine' (in the present instance) consists of inferential reasonings that the Author has put forward (under Sū 16 and 17),—these reasonings having, as they have, several ramifications in the shape of implications [the implication of Sū 16 being that *there are Sound-series*, and that of Sū 17 that *Ākāśa and Soul can have no constituent parts*. And inasmuch as these facts are already implied in the said Sūtras, the Author does not find it necessary to assert them in so many words]

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Further we ask—How is it to be known that a certain thing exists and another thing does not exist? "Well, when a thing is apprehended through a Means of Cognition [it is recognised as *existing*], and when it is not apprehended by a Means of Cognition [it is recognised as *non existing*]" In that case *your Sound would have to be regarded as non-existent*,—†

* For instance under Sū 3-1-1 he implies that Substance is distinct from 'Quality' but he nowhere says this in so many words—*Parituddhi*

† Those who regard Sound as eternal are asked to explain how it is to be ascertained whether or not a certain thing exists or not. Their answer naturally would be that when a thing is apprehended it is recognised as existing, and when it is not apprehended it is recognised as non existing. By this criterion the Siddhāntin rejoins Sound will have to be regarded as non existing before it is uttered, because of the reasons put forward in the following Sūtra (18)

The *Vārtika* suggests another introduction to the Sūtra. The Siddhāntin asks—When you regard the Jar as non-eternal, how do you know that it is

Sūtra 18

—before it is uttered; because it is not apprehended, and we do not find any obstruction (that could explain the non apprehension of the Sound)

BHĀṢYA

That is to say, prior to its utterance, Sound does not exist "How do you know that?" *Because it is not apprehended* "But even an existing thing may fail to be apprehended on account of the presence of obstructions" This explanation is not possible in the case in question "Why?" Because we do not find any such obstructions as would account for the non apprehension of Sound As a matter of fact, we do not find any such causes of non apprehension as—(1) that 'Sound is not apprehended because it is rendered imperceptible by such an obstruction',—or (2) that 'it is not close to the perceiving sense-organ',—or (3) that '(even though close to it) there is something intervening between the Sound and the sense-organ'." Hence the conclusion is that until it is uttered, *Sound does not exist*

"The utterance serves as a manifestor (of the Sound), that is the reason why, prior to utterance, Sound (even though existing) fails to be apprehended"

But what do you mean by the utterance (of Sound)?

"When there is a desire to speak, on the part of a person, this desire gives rise to an effort on his part,—this effort raises the wind in the man's body,—this wind on rising strikes certain parts of the mouth, in the shape of the throat, the palate and the like,—this impact of the wind with particular spots of the mouth brings about the manifestation of particular letter-sounds,—this is what is meant by utterance"

But this 'impact' is only a form of *Conjunction*, and it has been shown (in the *Bhāṣya*, on Su 13) that *Conjunction* cannot be

non-eternal? The answer of the Opponent would be—"We know that the Jar is non-eternal because (at times) it is not apprehended by means of any Instrument of Cognition." Thereupon the Siddhāntin rejoins—Exactly for this same reason Sound also should be regarded as non-eternal for reasons put forward in the Sūtra.

* व्यवधानादित्येवमादि is the right reading supplied by the Paris Ms.

the *manifest* (of Sound) Consequently the non-apprehension of Sound cannot be said to be due to the absence of the *manifest*, it is due in fact, to the sheer *non existence* of the Sound (at the time) Thus then, the fact that Sound is heard only when it is uttered leads us to the inference that when the Sound is heard, it comes into existence after having been non-existent* (prior to the utterance),—and that when *after* having been uttered, it is not heard,† what happens is that having come into existence, it ceases to exist, so that its not being heard is always due to its sheer *non existence* [in the former case, to *prior non-existence*, and in the latter case, to *destruction or cessation of existence*]

"But how do you know that it is so?"

We know this from the fact that *we do not find any obstruction etc*—as the *Sūtra* says

From all this the conclusion is that Sound is capable of being produced and of ceasing to exist

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Such being the actual state of things the Opponent, throwing dust, as it were, upon the truth, urges the following argument—

Sūtra 19

"As there is non-apprehension of the non-apprehension of obstruction,—this proves the existence of the obstruction",

BHĀṢYA

"If the non-existence of the obstruction is deduced from the simple fact of its not being apprehended,—then, inasmuch as the non-apprehension of the obstruction also is not apprehended, we should deduce, from this latter non-apprehension, the non-existence of the 'non-apprehension of obstruction', and this 'non-existence of the non-apprehension of obstruction' sets aside the denial of the 'obstruction'‡ 'But how do you prove

* अमृता is the right reading supported by the Puri Mss. also by the *Bhāṣyasūtra*

† The right reading is बोधारणमि ध्रुयते supported by the Puri Mss.

‡ The 'non-apprehension of obstruction,' being 'non-apprehension,' no 'apprehension' or perception of it is possible. Hence all that can be postulated of the 'non-apprehension' is that it is *not apprehended*, and (according to the reasoning propounded by the Siddhāntin himself in Sū. 18)

that the *non-apprehension of obstruction* is not apprehended? What is there to be proved in this? This fact is realised by everyone intuitively by himself, just as in all similar cases; that is to say, as a matter of fact, when a man fails to apprehend an *obstruction*, he intuitively realises that *he does not apprehend an obstruction*,—just as (in the reverse case) when he actually finds that a certain thing is hidden behind a wall, he intuitively realises that he apprehends an *obstruction*, and just as he knows that there is *apprehension of obstruction* so he should also know that there is *non-apprehension of obstruction* } but as he does not know that there is *non-apprehension of obstruction*, it follows that there is *no apprehension of the non-apprehension* } ”

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[To the above argument, the *Siddhāntin* replies]—If what you say is true, then that knocks the bottom completely out of the rejoinder urged by you *

The Opponent accepts, for the sake of argument, what the *Siddhāntin* has just said, and then proceeds with the following reasoning —

Sūtra 20

“If (as you say), even though there is ‘non-apprehension of obstruction,’ yet this ‘non-apprehension of obstruction’ exists,—then, in that case the mere non-apprehension of ‘obstruction’ cannot prove the non-existence of the ‘obstruction’.”

BHĀṢYA

“That is to say, just as (according to you) the ‘non-apprehension of obstruction’ exists, even though it is not apprehended,

when the ‘non apprehension of obstruction’ is *not-apprehended* it follows that the non apprehension of obstruction’ does not exist, which means that the obstruction’ is *apprehended*, which again proves that the Obstruction’ exists, for when we have the conception of the ‘apprehension of obstruction’, this conception cannot be entirely baseless

* The Opponent has declared that the ‘non-apprehension of obstruction’ can be realised intuitively —If that be so then that demolishes the whole Rejoinder put up by him; as this rejoinder based itself entirely upon the *non-apprehension* of the ‘non-apprehension of obstruction’ The term *uttaravakyam* in the *Bhāṣya* stands for ‘*jatvuttara*, the Futile Rejoinder contained on Sū 19

exactly in the same manner, the 'obstruction' also exists, (as urged by me) even though it is not apprehended. Now if you admit that, 'even though not apprehended,—the *non-apprehension of obstruction* exists',—and having admitted this, still go on to argue (as you have done in Sū 18) that 'as non obstruction is apprehended, it does not exist',—then under such a system of confession (and counter-confession), there can be no certainty as to any particular view being held by any person' *

Sūtra 21

[Reply to Sū 19 and 20]—Inasmuch as the 'non apprehension (of obstruction)' is of the nature of 'negation of apprehension (of obstruction)', the reason (put forward in Sū 19) is not a true one.

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact that which is *apprehended* (by means of a *positive* Instrument of Cognition) is accepted as *existing* while that which is *not-apprehended* (i.e., apprehended only by means of a *negative* Instrument of Cognition) is regarded as *non-existent*. Such being the case that which is of the nature of the 'negation of apprehension' should be regarded (by all parties) as a *non-entity*. Now [turning to the case in question] non apprehension' is merely the 'negation of apprehension' and being purely negative in its character (and as such having no positive form), it cannot be apprehended (by means of any *positive* Instrument of Cognition). On the other hand, inasmuch as *obstruction* is (according to you) an *existent* (positive) entity there should be *apprehension* of it,—as a matter of fact, however it is *not-apprehended*,—hence the conclusion is that it is *non-existent*. Under the circumstances,† it is not right to assert that 'the non apprehen-

* Sūtras 19 and 20 are meant to point out that the reasoning urged by the *Siddhāntin* in Sū 18 is *non-conclusive* —Tātparyā

For '*pratipattinīyamah*' in the *Bhāṣya* the *Bhāṣyacandra* reads '*pratipattinīyamah*' and explains it is *matpahyapratipadhanīyamah* according to this the passage means— it does not necessarily follow that it is our view that is wrong and not your '

† तत्र is the right reading for तच्च

tion of obstruction cannot prove the non-existence of the obstruction' (as urged by the Opponent in Su 20) *

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The Siddhāntin† asks]—When you declare Sound to be eternal, on what grounds do you base this declaration?

[The Opponent answers]—

Sūtra 22

(A) "Because of intangibility "

BHĀṢYA

"We have seen that *Ākāśa*, which is intangible, is eternal hence it follows that Sound is also so "

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The reason put forward by the Purvapakṣin, is 'inconclusive' (non-concomitant with the Probandum) in both ways, for (1) the Atom is *tangible* and yet *eternal* [which shows that *intangibility* is not the invariable concomitant of *eternality*], and (2) Motion is *intangible* and yet *non-eternal* [which shows that *eternality* is not always concomitant with *intangibility*] Against the reasoning "because Sound is intangible therefore it is eternal" —we have the next Sūtra pointing out an instance to the contrary (Motion) which is similar to the Subject (Sound), is 'intangible'—

Sūtra 23

The reasoning is not right, because Motion (which is 'intangible') is 'non-eternal'

BHĀṢYA

And the next Sūtra cites another instance to the contrary (the Atom), which is dissimilar to the Subject (Sound in being *tangible*)—

Sūtra 24

The reasoning is not right because the Atom (which is 'tangible') is 'eternal'

BHĀṢYA

Both these examples (cited in Su 23 and 24) show that the reasoning—"because Sound is intangible (it should be eternal)—is not valid

* This assumption of the Opponent cannot be right because as just shown the non-apprehension of an entity does prove its non-existence

† The *Bhāṣya candra* wrongly attributes this question to the 'Sūya pupil'. It is clearly addressed to the Opponent by the *Siddhāntin*.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The Opponent says]—"In that case, the following is the reason (for Sound being regarded as *eternal*)—

Sūtra 25

(B) "Because of its being imparted"—

"A thing that is *imparted* is found to be constant; and as Sound is *imparted*, by the Teacher to the Pupil, it should be regarded as *constant*."

Sūtra 26

This also is not a valid reason; because Sound is not found to exist in the space intervening between the two persons.

BHĀṢYA

What is there to indicate the existence of Sound in the space intervening between the person imparting (the word-sounds) and the person to whom they are imparted?

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The Opponent answers]—"It cannot be denied that it is only a thing that persists (such as gold etc.) that can leave the impartor and go over to the person to whom it is imparted. So that—

Sūtra 27

"In view of the fact that it (Sound) is taught, (the validity of) the reason cannot be gainsaid."

BHĀṢYA

"What indicates the persistence of Sound is the fact that it is *taught*; if the Sound did not continue to exist, it would not be possible for it to be *taught*."

Sūtra 28

In accordance with the two views, 'being taught' may mean one thing or another; hence the argument fails to meet the objection (urged by us).*

BHĀṢYA

That Word-Sounds are *taught* is admitted by both parties. But the doubt still remains, as to whether in the 'teaching', the *'Sound that originally subsisted in the Teacher goes over to the*

* The *Nyayasūcīmbandha* as also *Bhāṣyacandra*, mentions this as a Sūtra and it is also found in Sūtra Mss. A and B.

Pupil,—or when the Pupil is *taught*, he only imitates what he finds in the Teacher, as is the case with the *teaching* of Dancing, and by reason of this doubt, *being taught* cannot be a valid basis for the inference of Sound being “imparted”

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The Opponent says]—“Well, in that case the following shall be the reason (proving the persistence of Sound)”—

Sūtra 29

“Because there is repetition”

BHĀṢYA

“As a matter of fact, we have found that what is repeated persists, e.g., when one sees a certain colour *five times*, repeatedly, it means that what is seen is the same Colour that persists during all that time,—we have similar repetitions in connection with Sound, e.g., people speak of having read a certain Chapter *ten times* or *twenty times*, which must mean that there is repeated reading of what persists during all that time”

Sūtra 30

This cannot be right; for the term ‘repetition’ is used figuratively also, in cases where the things concerned are different (not the same)

BHĀṢYA

Even in cases where it is not the same thing persisting all the same, people speak of ‘repetition’, e.g., in such assertions as—‘please dance *twice*’, ‘please dance *thrice*’, ‘he danced *twice*’, ‘he danced *thrice*’, ‘he offers the Agnihotra *twice*’, ‘he eats *twice*’ [in all which cases the acts, of *dancing*, *offering* and *eating* spoken of as ‘repeated’ are not the same, the first *dancing* being different from the second *dancing* and so forth]

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The Opponent’s reasoning having been thus shown to be based upon false premises, he proceeds to object (by verbal casuistry) to the use of the term ‘*anya*’, ‘different.’

Sūtra 31

“When a thing is ‘different’, it is ‘different’ from something that is ‘different’ (from it)—and what is ‘different’ from the ‘different’ must be ‘non-different’—so that there is nothing that can be regarded as (purely) ‘different’”

BHĀṢYA

That which you regard as 'different' is *non-different* from itself; hence that cannot be regarded as 'different', [and, as the Sūtra says, what is *different* from the 'different' is *non-different* also; hence that also cannot be regarded as 'different'], so that there is no possibility of anything being regarded as (purely) 'different'. Hence what has been urged (in Su 29)—that 'the term *repetition* is used figuratively also in cases where the things concerned are *different*'—is not right [The very conception of 'difference' being impossible]

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

In answer to the Opponent who has objected to the use of a word (by the Siddhāntin, in Su 29), the Siddhāntin urges an objection against the use of a word (by the Opponent himself, in Sū 30)—

Sūtra 32

If there is no conception of the 'different' there can be none of 'non-difference', as the two conceptions are mutually relative

BHĀṢYA

You are urging that the 'different' is 'non-different', and having urged that you deny the conception of the 'different', you yet admit the conception of the 'non-different', and you yourself actually use the term 'non-different'. But as a matter of fact, 'non-different' is a compound word—where the word 'different' is compounded with the negative particle 'non', now if the second term of the compound is impossible (i.e. without a real denotation), with what would the negative particle be compounded? In fact, of the two terms 'different' and 'non-different', one is possible only in relation to the other. Thus, when you say that 'there is nothing that can be regarded as *different*' you say what if not quite right

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The Opponent puts forward another argument in support of the eternality of Sound]—"Well, now, we must accept the Sound to be eternal,—

Sūtra 33

"also* because we do not perceive any cause for its destruction".

BHĀṢYA

"Whatever thing is non-eternal, its destruction is brought about by some cause, e g., the destruction of the Clod of earth is brought about by the disruption of its component particles,—now if Sound were non-eternal, we should certainly perceive the cause of its destruction,—as a matter of fact however, we do not perceive any such cause† (of the destruction of Sound),—hence it follows that Sound is eternal"

[Answer to the above argument]

Sūtra 34

Inasmuch as we do not find any cause for Sound not being heard, it would mean that (if Sound is eternal) it should be heard always

BHĀṢYA

Just as not finding any cause for its destruction, you argue that Sound should be eternal,—in the same manner, not finding any cause for its not being heard (when it exists), we can argue that Sound (being eternal) should be always heard "But the non-hearing of Sound (at times) is due to the absence of a manifestor (of it)" The hypothesis of the 'manifestor' has been already exploded And such being the case, if there is non-hearing of the existing Sound, even without a cause (of this non-hearing), in the same manner, there would also be destruction of the existing Sound even without a cause (of that destruction) And as for being contrary to all apparent facts,—that applies equally to both the contingencies,—of causeless destruction, as well as causeless non-hearing

Sūtra 35

But (in reality) we do perceive it (the cause of the destruction of Sound), so that the said non-apprehension (of

* The Nyayasūtrasambandha and the Purī Mā of Sūtra both read a 'cha' here

† The Bhāṣyaconstrues the Sūtra as 'śrīśālikāranena anupalabdhiḥ' which can only mean—the non-apprehension of sound is due to the cause of destruction. This interpretation is not supported either by the Bhāṣya or by the Vārtika

for instance, we find that in a case where a man, though close by, fails to hear a Sound emanating on the other side of a wall, while even though the man is at a distance, he does hear the Sound, if there is no obstacle intervening. Then again, when a bell is rung, what is heard is a continuous series of Sounds, as is clear from the fact that the several Sounds heard are of varying degrees of loudness or dullness, now if Sound were *eternal* it would be necessary,—in order to account for this continuous series of audition—to postulate an equally permanent *Sound-manifester* abiding either in the Bell or in the Sound-series or in something else, [it would be necessary to find some such cause] as it has to be explained how, the Sound remaining the *same* (*ex-hypothesi*), there is a *diversity* in the hearing (as evinced by the varying degrees of intensity perceived). If, on the other hand, Sound is (regarded as) *non-eternal*, [the said phenomenon can be explained by the hypothesis that] there appears (at each stage of the Series) a fresh cause in the shape of a certain continuous stream of momentum, more or less forcible, subsisting in the Bell (as long as the Sound continues to be heard), which acts as an aid to the *contact* producing the initial Sound,—and by reason of this continued appearance of causes, there appears the Series of Sounds, and the greater or less force of the momentum gives rise to the greater or less intensity of the Sound, and this accounts for the aforesaid diversity of audition *

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Sūtra 37*

Further, if the mere fact of the cause of its destruction not being perceived were to prove that a thing still abides—then that thing (e.g., the audition of Sound) also would have to be regarded as eternal

BHĀṢYA

If it be held that when the cause of the destruction of a thing is not perceived, that thing should be regarded as 'still abiding,—and as abiding, it should be eternal,—then, in regard to *Sound hearings*, which you hold to be only to many *manifestations of Sound*, as you do not point out any cause of destruction it would follow, from this non-indication that the said *hearings* continue to abide, and as such should be regarded as *eternal*. If this be not so, then it is not right to argue (as the Opponent has done) that, "because the destruction of Sound is not perceived, it must be regarded as abiding, and hence eternal."

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The *Sāṅkhya* comes forward with his objection against the Nyāya view of Sound]—" (In the case of bell ringing) we find that the *Resonance* subsists in the same substratum with the *Vibration* and hence it ceases, like the *Vibration*, upon the removal of its cause by the hand touch,—if on the other hand the *Resonance* subsisted in another substratum (and not in the same substratum with the *Vibration*) then on the touch of the striking object (Hand), what would cease would be that which subsists in the same substratum (and not the *Resonance*, which *ex hypothesi* subsists in another substratum) [For this reason, Sound must be regarded as subsisting in the sounding substance, wherein the vibrations subsist,—that is, in the Air,—and not in *Ākāśa* as held by the *Naiyāyika*]"

[In answer to this, we have the following Sūtra]—

* This Sūtra reverts to the *Purvapakṣa* argument put forward in Sū 36 सिद्धावलोभितन्यायान् पूर्वाक्ष हेतु दूषयति—says the *Tātparyya*. The same argument that the Opponent had urged in support of the eternality of sound the *Siddhāntin* now turns in support of the continuity of sound audition — *Bhāṣyacandra*

Sūtra 38

Inasmuch as (the substratum of Sound) is intangible, the said objection (against Sound subsisting in *Ākāśa*) does not hold.

BHĀṢYA

The *Sāṅkhya* objects to the view that Sound is a quality subsisting in *Ākāśa*, but this objection cannot be maintained, for the simple reason that the substratum of Sound (i.e. *Ākāśa*) is intangible. As a matter of fact, we find that the Sound-series is perceived even at a time when there is no perception of anything possessing Colour and other qualities, which shows that Sound has for its substratum a substance which is intangible and all-pervading,—and it does not subsist in the same substratum with the *Vibrations*.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Further, it is not right to hold that Sound is manifested as subsisting in each substance, along with Colour and other qualities (as held by the *Sāṅkhyas*) "Why?"

Sūtra 39

Because, if Sound formed an aggregate (along with Colour &c),—inasmuch as there are also divisions and subdivisions of it, [Sound could not be regarded as manifested]

BHĀṢYA

The particle 'cha', 'also', points to the presence of the series of Sounds as a further reason (for denying the mere manifestation of Sound), which has already been explained (under Su. 16)

If Sounds, Colours and other qualities co-exist in each substance, and form an aggregate (as held by the *Sāṅkhya*),—then, inasmuch as it is found that in any particular substance, the Colour or some other quality is always perceived to be of one and the same kind, it would follow that Sound also (as forming a member of that same aggregate of qualities) should always be perceived to be of one and the same kind. And under the circumstances, there would be no possibility of—(1) the 'division' or diversity involved in the well-known phenomenon, that when Sound appears in connection with a substance (the string of a musical instrument, for instance), it is found to consist of several sounds of diverse kinds, belonging to different notes (in the musical scale),—or (2) of the 'sub-division' involved in the

phenomenon, that in the case of the Sounds of the same form, of the same kind and belonging to the same musical note, we perceive a diversity, due to the varying grades of intensity * [Both these phenomena would be impossible, in accordance with the Sankhya theory, because] the said phenomena could be possible only if there were *several* Sounds and they were *produced*, and not if there is a *single* Sound and that also is *manifested*. As a matter of fact, however, we know that the said 'division and sub-division' do exist. So that from the existence of these 'divisions and sub-divisions' we conclude that Sound cannot be *manifested* as subsisting in each substance, along with Colour and other qualities.

SECTION (3)

The Modifications of Sound

Sūtras 40-54

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Sound is of two kinds—Letter-sounds and Sound in general (Noise) † Now in regard to Letter-sounds—

* The *Bhāṣya* explains division as division into Letters and 'sub-division' as Sound and Resonance.

† 'Letter sound—in the shape of a *k* &c and noise—the sound produced by conch blowing says *Prasastapada*.

Sound in general has been dealt with up to Sū 38. The author now takes up the particular kind of Sound in the shape of Letter sounds which form the subject matter of the present enquiry as is clear from the fact that the Sound modifications dealt with are only those pertaining to Letter sounds—*Tatparya*.

The connection of the present section with what has gone before is thus explained by the *Tatparya*—The *Sāṅkhya* view that Sound is manifested as co-existing with Colour and other qualities, having been refuted—the same *Sāṅkhya* turns round with the view that though Sound may not be eternal in the sense of continuing to exist in the same unchanged form yet it could be eternal in the sense that it continues to exist and undergo modifications just in the manner as Primordial Matter is regarded as eternal, just as gold remains gold even in its endless modifications and in support of this view we mention the grammatical laws of *sandhi* by which Letter sounds undergo certain modifications. With a view to demolish this view the Author proceeds to show that in the case of Letter-sounds there is no such modification or transmutation as would justify us in regard of them as having a continuity of existence.

Sūtra 40

There arises a doubt, because there is mention of both 'modification', and 'substitution'.

BHĀṢYA

In connection with the expression '*dadhyatra*' (as resulting from the combination of '*dadhi*' and '*atra*') some* people hold that the '*i*' (in '*dadhi*') renounces its own form and takes the form of '*ya*',—the sense of this view being that [what the grammatical law lays down is that, when *i* is followed by *a*] there is a *modification* (of *i* into *ya*)—Others†, however, hold that what happens is that, the '*i*' having been used (in the expression '*dadhi atra*'), it gives up its place, and in the place thus vacated the letter '*ya*' comes to be used (in the expression '*dadhi-atra*'),—the sense of this latter view being that [what the grammatical law means is that] when *i* and *a* are in juxtaposition, we use *ya* and not *i*, so that there is *substitution* (of *ya* in place of *i*) Both these opinions have been held (in connection with the grammatical law embodied in Pāṇini's sūtras, *iko yanacī* 6.1.77) So that one does not know what the truth is [unless he carries on a full enquiry into the matter]

The true view is that there is *substitution*

(A) As regards the theory of 'modification',—as a matter of fact, we do not perceive any continuity or persistence, so that there can be no inference of 'modification' If there were some sort of persistence (of the *i*-sound, even in the form '*dadhyatra*'), it would show that something of it (some part of its character) had ceased and something else come in, and this might justify the inference that there is 'modification',—as a matter of fact, however, no such persistence is ever perceived,—hence the conclusion is that there is no 'modification' §—(B) Secondly, we

* The *Bhāṣyatandra* attributes this view to the followers of Kaṭīpa* and quotes a *Kaṭīpa-Sūtra*.

† The followers of Pāṇini—says the *Bhāṣyatandra*

§ In the well-known cases of 'modification'—e.g. when a lump of gold is transmuted into a pair of ear-rings or bracelets—they are regarded as 'modification', because whatever the particular shape, through everyone of them the character of 'Gold' persists. But in '*ya*' (in '*dadhyatra*') we do not find any such persistence of the '*i*'-sound, so that this cannot be a case of 'modification'—*Tātparyo*

find that the two letters (*i* and *ya*) being amenable to different instrumental forces, the utterance of one is possible without the utterance of the other, that is to say, as a matter of fact, the letter '*i*' is amenable to the instrumentality of what is called the 'open articulation' (applicable to vowels), while the letter '*ya*' is amenable to the instrumentality of the 'slightly touched articulation' (applicable to semi vowels), so that these two letters are pronouncible by two different kinds of 'effort', called 'instrumentality', and this is what makes it possible for one of them being uttered while the other is not uttered [and all this shows that *ya* is only the *substitute*, and not the *modification*, of *i*]* — (C) *Thirdly*, the case in question (that of *ya* in *dadhyatra*) is exactly analogous to that where there is no 'modification', that is to say, there are cases where *i* and *ya* are not 'modifications' at all (even according to you), e.g., in such expressions as (*a*) '*yataṭe*', '*yacchati*', and '*prayamsta*' (where there can be no chance of *ya* being a 'modification' at all), and, '*ikārah*', '*idam*' (where *i* remains itself, without undergoing any change at all), — and there are well marked cases where the two do appear like 'modifications', e.g. '*istva*' (which is derived from the root '*yaj*', and in which therefore, the *i* appears in the place of the *ya* in the root) and '*dadhyihara*' which is the altered form resulting from the combination of '*dadhi*' and '*āhara*', (of which the *i* is changed into *ya*) — Now as a matter of fact, in both these cases, (of the utterance of *ya* or *i*, appearing by itself or as 'modification'), the effort of the speaker is precisely the same, and precisely the

The *Parivuddhi* remarks — The term '*vikāra*' in the present context does not stand for transmutation, the total destruction of one thing and the appearance in its place of another thing — as no such '*vikāra*' is admitted by the *Saṃkhya* — it stands for that *change* in which the basic element remaining the same its characteristics appear and disappear. And as there is no such basic element of which *i* could be a characteristic detail — no 'modification' can be possible in this case.

* If *ya* were the modification of *i* the forces necessary for its utterance would be the same as those necessary for the utterance of *i* — as a matter of fact however the force that is put into operation for the uttering of *ya* is that in the form of the effort called 'slightly touched articulation' while in the case of *i*, the effort is that called 'open articulation'. Thus it is that for the uttering of *ya* it is not necessary to have a previous utterance of *i*. And this would not be possible if *ya* were a modification of *i*.

same also is the hearing of the hearer. All this shows that (in 'dadhyatra') we have *substitution* (of *ya*, and not *modification* of *i*) *—(D) *Fourthly*, there is no perception of it in actual usage. That is to say, in actual usage, *i* is never perceived as becoming *ya*, † what is perceived, however, is that *ya* is used in the place where *i* had been used before. From this also it follows that *ya* is not a 'modification' of *i* ‡

The denial of *ya* being the 'modification' of *i* does not set aside the grammatical law (that '*ik* followed by *ach* becomes *yan*'—Pāṇini, 6-1-77). That is to say even in accordance with the view that *letters do not undergo modifications*, it is not impossible to have the grammatical law (of letter-changes)—which contingency (of impossibility of the law) should compel us to admit the 'modification' of letters. As a matter of fact, one letter is not the product of another letter, e.g. *ya* is not produced from *i*, nor is *i* produced from *ya*, each letter emanates from a distinct spot in the organ of speech and is the outcome of a distinct articulation, so that the correct view is that what happens (in the case of changes) is that *one is uttered in the place of another* [Hence what the grammatical law '*iko yanaci*' means is that when *i* and *a* are in juxtaposition, we should use *ya* in the place of *i*, and *not* that *i* is *modified* into *ya*]. And only if these two facts were otherwise, could the change in question be regarded either as a 'modification', or as a case of 'one being produced out of the other'. As a matter of fact, however, these two facts are not otherwise. Hence the conclusion is that there is no 'modification' of letters.

(E) Just as the 'modification' of a group of letters is not, possible, so is the 'modification' of a single letter also not

* The effort necessary for the uttering of *ya* in '*yata*' is exactly the same as that necessary for its uttering in the expression '*dadhyatra*', similarly the effort required for uttering *i* in '*idam*' is the same as that required for its uttering in '*iffra*', which shows that the '*ya*' in both cases is of the same kind, † e.g. just as in '*yata*', the *ya* is not a 'modification', so in '*dadhyatra*' also it is not a modification, and so on.

† E.g., we perceive the gold becoming the bracelet—*Bhāṣya*—

‡ In the case of the well-known case of 'modification' of milk into curd, we can perceive the milk becoming curd, in the same manner we should perceive the *i* becoming *ya*, if the letter were a 'modification' of *i*.

possible. In accordance with the rules—'the root *as* becomes *bhū*,' 'the root *brū* becomes *vac*'—where *as* is changed into *bhū* and *brū* into *vac*,—this change of one set of letters in the root into another set of letters is not in any case regarded either as a 'modification', or as a case of one being produced out of the other, it is only regarded as a case of one set of letters being used in the place of another set of letters,—exactly similar should be the case when one letter (*i*) is changed into another (*ya*) *

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

For the following reason also letters cannot be regarded as undergoing 'modifications'—

Sūtra 41

Because the enlargement of the original cause should always involve a corresponding enlargement in the modification

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, we always find that modifications always follow their original base †. In the case in question however we do not find the *ya* following the shortness or length of the *i* [as whether the preceding *i* is long or short, the *ya* is always short],—and it is only if there were such following by the *ya*, that we could infer it to be a 'modification'

Sūtra 42

[*Objection*].—"The reason just urged is not a valid one, because, as a matter of fact, Modifications are found to be smaller than, equal to and larger than their original base"

BHĀṢYA

* In the case of Substances we find that some modifications are smaller than their original base, some are equal to it while

* The *Parīśuddhi* formulates this reasoning as follows.—The case of the change of *i* into *ya* cannot be one of modification—because the two are distinct letters—just like *bhū* appearing in place of *as*

† For instance, the cloth made of long yarns is long and that made of shorter yarns is shorter—says the *Bhāṣyacandra*

some are larger In the same manner *ya*, as the *modification* (of the long *i*), may be *smaller* (than its basic cause) **

[The *Vārtika* does not notice this *Sūtra* 42]

Sūtra 43

[Answer]—Inasmuch as there is (in the Opponent's reasoning) neither of the two kinds of Probans, the mere example cannot prove anything

(a) In the argument urged by the Opponent (in *Sū* 41), we do not find any Probans at all,—neither one 'similar' to the example, nor one 'dissimilar' to it [and these are the only two kinds of Probans, as explained under *Sū* 1-1-34 and 35],—

(b) secondly (though an example has been cited) a mere example, unless taken along with a Probans, cannot prove anything,—

(c) lastly, as counter-instances are available (in support of the contrary conclusion), there would be an uncertainty in regard

to the conclusion (sought to be proved), [this counter instance being as follows —] it sometimes happens that for the carrying

of a load, a horse is yoked in the place of an ox,—and just as in this case the Horse is not regarded as a 'modification' of the

Ox, so, when *ya* is used in place of *i*, it cannot be regarded as a 'modification' of *i* And certainly there is no such rule as that

a conclusion can be proved only by an example, and not by a counter-example †

* "From the small seed of the banyan emanates the large banyan tree while out of the large cocoanut, which is larger than the banyan-seed comes out the cocoanut tree, which is smaller than the banyan tree, and from cocoanuts of equal size we get trees of equal size"—*Tātparyā*

It would be more in keeping with the text if we had the following examples—(1) From the small seeds we get the tree, which is the modification of the seed, and is larger than it, (2) from a large volume of steam we get a small quantity of water, where the water, the modification of the steam, is smaller in volume than the steam and (3) when milk turns into curd, the modification curd, is equal in volume to the milk

The *Bhāṣya* and *śāstra* gives the following examples —(1) From the elongated gold pieces, we get the round ear-ring, (2) from smooth yarns we get smooth cloth, (3) from the small ball of cotton we get the long yarns. All this shows that the modification need not always correspond to its original.

† This *Sūtra* answers *Sū* 41, taking it as an argument advanced to prove the conclusion that *ya* is a modification of *i*. But *Sū* 41 may be taken, not as an argument to prove a conclusion, but only as pointing out a defect, a fallacy, in the premiss of the Siddhāntin's reasoning. The answer to this comes in *Sū* 44

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

As regards the examples of the 'modification' of Substances, cited by the Opponent,—our answer is that—

Sūtra 44

It is not right, as 'modifications' always emanate from such original bases as are unequal [and they are always in conformity with these latter]

BHĀṢYA

Substances that constitute the origin (from which *modifications* emanate) are such as are not equal (to them), and yet the modifications are always in conformity with their original bases * In the case in question, however, we find that the letter *ya* is not always in conformity with (does not necessarily emanate from) the letter : † Hence the citing of the example of the modification of substances is not effective against us.

Sūtra 45

[Objection]—"Just as there is diversity in the character of the modification of Substances, so is there diversity in the modification of Letters also "

BHĀṢYA

'Just as in the case of Substances the modification differs from its original, even though both equally are *Substance*—so in the case of Letters also, though both equally are '*Letter*,' yet the modification differs from the original' §

* E.g. From the small banyan seed emanates the large banyan tree and yet from that seed will emanate only the *banyan* and never the *cocos* nut tree

† This is what we mean by what we have urged in Sū. 40 as regards the modifications following their origins and not that the largeness and smallness of the modification follows those of the origin. If we meant the latter then alone could the argument urged against us by the Opponent in Sū. 42 be effective

§ In the case of Substances also it is not true that the modification always follows its original because as a matter of fact we often find that there is a diversity between the modification and its original, so that even though the *ya* does not follow the : in its length or shortness yet it may be its modification

"The sense of the argument is as follows: When the modification is spoken of as *following* its original is it meant that the *following* or *conformity* is *absolute*?—or that it is only *partial*? If the former then no such conformity would be possible in the case of substances also. If the latter then in the case of Letters also there is conformity so far that both are Letter. —*Bhāṣyaśāstra*

Sūtra 46

[Answer]—That cannot be; as the real character of 'Modification' is not possible (in the case of Letters).

BHĀṢYA

In the case of Substances in general we find the character of 'Modification' to be as follows —When a Substance, gold or clay, undergoes *modification*, what happens is that the general character of that substance (Gold or Clay) remaining constant, one form or shape of it (i.e. the Lump of Gold or Clay) disappears and another (i.e. the Ring or the Jar) comes into existence, and this latter they call 'modification'. In the case of Letters on the other hand (such for instance as the letters *ya* and *i*), there is no such general 'Letter' character which, remaining constant, would give up its '*i*'-form and take up the '*ya*'-form*. So that, just as in the case of the Ox and the Horse, even though both are 'Substance,' yet, by reason of the diversity in their character, one is not regarded as the 'modification' of another,—simply because they do not fulfil the conditions of the true 'modification',—exactly in the same manner, the letter *ya* cannot be regarded as the 'modification' of the letter *i*, for the simple reason that the conditions of the true 'modification' are not fulfilled in this case.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

For the following reason also Letters cannot have modifications —

Sūtra 47

[As a matter of fact] when things have undergone 'modification', they cannot revert to their original form.

BHĀṢYA

Reversion (to the original form) is not possible [for real modifications, e.g. Curd cannot again become Milk] "How do you know that?" We know this because there is no proof for such reversion. That is to say, there is nothing to prove—no reasoning available for the view—that "what happens (in the case

* For it is only the particular letter *i* that is held by the Opponent to be modified into another particular letter '*ya*'; while in the case of substances the Gold lump becomes modified into the Gold ring, the Gold-character being common —*Bhāṣyacandra*

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

As regards the examples of the 'modification' of Substances, cited by the Opponent,—our answer is that—

Sūtra 44

It is not right, as 'modifications' always emanate from such original bases as are unequal [and they are always in conformity with these latter].

BHĀṢYA

Substances that constitute the origin (from which modifications emanate) are such as are not equal (to them), and yet the modifications are always in conformity with their original bases * In the case in question, however, we find that the letter *ya* is not always in conformity with (does not necessarily emanate from) the letter *i*.† Hence the citing of the example of the modification of substances is not effective against us.

Sūtra 45

[Objection]—"Just as there is diversity in the character of the modification of Substances, so is there diversity in the modification of Letters also"

BHĀṢYA

"Just as in the case of Substances, the modification differs from its original, even though both equally are Substance,—so in the case of Letters also, though both equally are 'Letter,' yet the modification differs from the original"§

* E.g. From the small banyan seed emanates the large banyan tree and yet from that seed will emanate only the banyan, and never the coconut tree

† This is what we meant by what we have urged in Su. 40, as regards the modifications following their origins, and not that the largeness and smallness of the modification follows those of the origin. If we meant this latter, then alone could the argument urged against us by the Opponent in Su. 42 be effective

§ * In the case of Substances also it is not true that the modification always follows its original, because as a matter of fact we often find that there is a diversity between the modification and its original, so that, even though the *ya* does not follow the *i* in its length or shortness, yet it may be its modification.

"The sense of the argument is as follows. When the modification is spoken of as following its original is it meant that the following or conformity is absolute?—or that it is only partial? If the former, then no such conformity would be possible in the case of substances also. If the latter, then in the case of Letters also there is conformity so far that both are 'Letter'."—Bhāṣyacandra

Sūtra 46

[Answer]—That cannot be; as the real character of 'Modification' is not possible (in the case of Letters)

BHĀṢYA

In the case of Substances in general we find the character of 'Modification' to be as follows —When a Substance, gold or clay, undergoes *modification*, what happens is that the general character of that substance (Gold or Clay) remaining constant, one form or shape of it (i.e. the Lump of Gold or Clay) disappears and another (i.e. the Ring or the Jar) comes into existence, and this latter they call 'modification'. In the case of Letters on the other hand (such for instance as the letters *ya* and *i*) there is no such general 'Letter' character which, remaining constant, would give up its 'i' form and take up the 'ya' form*. So that, just as in the case of the Ox and the Horse, even though both are 'Substance,' yet, by reason of the diversity in their character, one is not regarded as the 'modification' of another,—simply because they do not fulfil the conditions of the true 'modification',—exactly in the same manner, the letter *ya* cannot be regarded as the 'modification' of the letter *i*, for the simple reason that the conditions of the true 'modification' are not fulfilled in this case.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

For the following reason also Letters cannot have modifications —

Sūtra 47

[As a matter of fact] when things have undergone 'modification', they cannot revert to their original form

BHĀṢYA

Reversion (to the original form) is not possible [for real modifications, e.g., Curd cannot again become Milk] "How do you know that?" We know this because there is no proof for such reversion. That is to say, there is nothing to prove—no reasoning available for the view—that "what happens (in the case

* For it is only the particular letter *i* that is held by the Opponent to be modified into another particular letter *ya*, while in the case of substances the Gold lump becomes modified into the Gold ring, the Gold character being common.—*Bhāṣyaśeṣa*

As a matter of fact, the *Ear ring* and the *Necklet* are forms or properties that subsist in the *Gold*, and not in the *Universal* or generic character of 'Gold'.—Now, what is that Letter of which 'i' and 'ya' are properties? They cannot be properties of the generic character of 'Letter', as this is a *Universal* (and not *something possessed of the Universal*) [Even granting that these could be properties or forms of the said *Universal*] as a matter of fact, a property or form that is ceasing (or disappearing) cannot form the origin of another forthcoming property, hence in the case in question, the 'i' that is *ceasing* (or *disappearing*) could not be the origin of the forthcoming 'ya' [which means that 'ya' cannot be the 'modification' of 'i']

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

For the following reason also no 'modification' of Letters is possible —

Sūtra 50

If Letters are eternal, they cannot undergo [or become] modifications,—if they are non-eternal, they cannot persist (as a constant factor)

BHĀṢYA

According to the theory that Letters are *eternal*, the letters *i* and *ya* should both be eternal, so that neither could be regarded as a 'modification', for both being eternal, what could be the 'modification' of what? [as all 'modifications' as such must be non-eternal] If on the other hand the view is held that Letters are non-eternal then no persistence or continuity of Letters would be possible. 'What do you mean by Letters having no persistence?' What is meant by this 'want of persistence' is that having come into existence, they cease to exist, so that (under this theory) it is only after the 'i', having come into existence, had ceased to exist, that the 'ya' would come into existence, and the 'i' would come into existence again only after the 'ya', having come into existence had ceased to exist, and under the circumstances (the two never coexisting at any point of time), what would be the 'modification' of what? What we have said (in regard to the *i* and *ya* coming into existence and ceasing to exist) should be taken as referring to the

combining (of the two words 'dadhi atra') after having stated them in the disjoined form, and again disjoining them after having combined them *

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The Opponent makes the following answer† (on the basis of the theory that letters are *eternal*) to the argument (propounded by the *Siddhāntin*)—

Sūtra 51

"Inasmuch as most Eternal things are beyond the reach of the senses, and yet there are some that are of the opposite character—the denial of Letter-modification is not right "

BHĀṢYA

"It is not quite correct‡ to say that *eternal words can never undergo modifications* [Because] as a matter of fact we find that, of *eternal* things, while some are *beyond the reach of the senses* (e g., the *Atom* and *Ākasa*) there are some that are quite perceptible by the senses (e g., the *Universal* 'cow' and the like), in fact Letters themselves are perceptible (by the Senses) and yet they are eternal, or *hypothetical* similarly of eternal things though some (e g., *Ākasa*) may be incapable of undergoing modification, yet Letters may be quite capable of doing so

But the presence of *contrary properties* cannot be accepted as a valid reason, because there is *incompatibility* (between *eternality* and *capability of modification*), [while there is no such incompatibility between *eternality* and *perceptibility* or *imperceptibility*] That which is *eternal* is never born nor does it ever cease to exist, that which is devoid of the character of *being born* and that of *ceasing to exist* is *eternal*, while that which is possessed of the character of *being born* and of *ceasing to exist* is *non-eternal*, and as a matter of fact, there can be no 'modification' without something being born and something ceasing to

* When we say *dadhi-atra* the *i* comes into existence when we say '*d-dhi-atra*' the *i* ceases to exist and the *ya* comes into existence when we again disjoin the words and say '*d-dhi-atra*', the *y* ceases to exist and the *i* comes into existence

† This answer is in the form of a *Futile Repplier*—says the *Tātparyā*

‡ The *Bhāṣya* *isāndra* explains '*apratishedhah*' as equivalent to *apratishedhah*.

same thing] Thus the mere presence of *Constancy* in *Non constancy* does not constitute an effective objection against us *

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

In fact, what appears (and is regarded) as the 'modification of Letters' is not that one Letter becomes transformed into another, or that one Letter (as product) is produced out of the other (as the constituent cause), what it really is, is shown in the following *Sūtra*—

Sūtras 57

What appears as the 'modification of Letters' involves a change in (one or the other of) the following forms—(a) the coming in of fresh properties, (b) suppression, (c) diminution (d) increase, (e) curtailment and (f) coalescence —

BHĀṢYA

What is actually meant by 'the modification of Letters' is that, there is substitution of another cognate letter,—i e , one cognate letter is used on the cessation of the use of another, and this substitution is in diverse forms,—(a) in some cases there is *coming in of fresh properties*, e g , when the low accent takes the place of the high-pitched accent,—(b) in some there is *suppression*, e g , when one form being dropped, another comes in its place,—(c) in certain cases there is *diminution*, e g , when the short vowel takes the place of the long one,—(d) in others there is *increase*, e g , when the long vowel takes the place of the short one, or the prolated vowel takes the place of the long and short one,—(e) in certain cases there is *curtailment*, i e , 'afah' (a single syllable) takes the place of 'afsi' (two syllables),—(f) in other cases there is *coalescence*, e g , when there is an augment, either in the base or in the affix. These are the changes that are spoken of as 'modifications'; and these are only *substitutions*. If this is what is meant by 'modification,' then we admit the statement that 'Letters undergo modifications'.

* What is impossible is the co subsistence of both *Constancy* and *Non-constancy*, in any one thing and not the subsistence of *Constancy* in *Non-constancy*. And this latter fact does not shake our position as the mere fact of there being *Constancy* in *Non-constancy* does not imply that there is *constancy* as regards the *Original* and *Modification*. It is admitted that there is *non-constancy* in regard to this, and if the *Constancy* of the *Non-constancy* were to imply *Constancy* as regards the *Original* and *Modification*, then it would mean that in regard to this latter there are both *Constancy* and *Non-constancy* which however is impossible.

SECTION (4)

*Examination of the nature of Words and their Potencies**Sutra 58*

These same (Letters) when ending in an affix, are called 'Word'

BHĀṢYA

Letters, transformed according to law and reason (i.e., by substitution, and not by modification) when ending in an affix, come to be called 'Word'. Affixes are of two kinds—*Noun affixes* and *Verb-affixes*, *brāhmaṇah* is an example (of a Word ending in a noun affix) and *pacati* is an example (of a Word ending in a verb affix).

"According to this definition Prepositions and Indeclinables could not be called Word. Hence it is necessary to propound some other definition of Word.

But it is with a view to make the term Word (according to the said definition) applicable to Prepositions and Indeclinables that it has been ruled that Indeclinables drop their affixes—[by Pāṇini's Sutra 2.4-82],—and the reason for this convention lies in the fact that it is only Words that can signify (bring about the cognition of) anything [and it is admitted that Prepositions and Indeclinables do signify things]*

* This Sutra is aimed against the *Sphota* theory of the Grammarians. This theory is thus outlined in the *Tatparya*—

Things are not signified by Letters as Letters cannot have any connection with anything either singly or collectively. Nor can things be held to be signified by the last letter as aided by the impressions left by the preceding letters. Because Impressions can pertain to their own objects and not to other things. Hence the impression of Letters could bring about the cognition of Letters only and not of things. And yet it cannot be denied that when the Letters 'gha jar' are pronounced there comes about the cognition of the Jar. Hence the conclusion is that the letters concerned bring about the manifestation of a peculiar entity in the shape of *Sphota*—a kind of conglomerate sound—which in its turn brings about the cognition of the Jar. That several Letters should give rise to one *Sphota* is just like several Words forming a sentence. Hence there is no such thing as Word denoting things.

In answer to this view, we have the Sūtra laying down that the Word—by which things are denoted—consists of the Letters themselves—and not of any such thing as '*Sphota*'. As a matter of fact, when a thing is spoken

The discussion that follows is in regard to Nouns; and we take for our example the particular word 'gauh', 'Cow.'

Now, in connection with this—*

Sūtra 59

There arises a doubt; because the Word is used in reference to the Individual, the Configuration and the Universal, as inseparable from one another.

BHĀṢYA

The term 'sannidhi' signifies 'inseparable existence', i.e. invariable concomitance. As a matter of fact, the word 'Cow' is used in connection with the Individual, the Configuration and the Universal,—as inseparable from one another; and it is not definitely known whether what is denoted by the Word is any one of these three, or all of them.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

What forms the real denotation of a word can be ascertained only from the force of usage. And from this it is clear that—

Sūtra 60

(A)—"It is the Individual (that should be regarded as denoted by the Word); because all usage—in the form of (a) the term 'that which,' (b) grouping, (c) giving, (d) possession, (e) number, (f) enlargement, (g) contraction,† (h) colour, (i) compounding and (j) procreation—appertains to the Individual."

of by means of a verbal expression, we do not perceive anything except certain Letters. Hence we conclude that the name 'Word' must apply to the Letters, though it may not apply directly to them, these being many, and the word being one only,—yet the name may be applied to them indirectly, on the basis of the fact that though many, they bring about the cognition of a single thing. And so long as we can explain the phenomenon of verbal expression on the basis of the directly perceptible Letters, there can be no justification for the assuming of a superphysical and purely hypothetical entity in the shape of 'Spṛṣṭa'.

* तदर्थे is usually printed as part of Sūtra 58, but the न्यायसूचीनिबन्ध and the Purī Sū. Ms. both read the Sū. without तदर्थे which therefore we take as part of the Introductory Bhāṣya. The Bhāṣyacandra makes it part of the Sūtra.

† The viz. text reads उपचय, the right reading is अचय as found in the Purī Mss.

(A)—[The Individualistic Theory is first put forward]—

"It is the Individual that is denoted by the word How so ? Because such usage as is represented by the use of the term '*that which*' and the rest applies to the *Individual*

'*Upacāra*,' 'appertaining,' here stands for application

"(a) Such sentences as '*that which stands*' '*that which is sitting*' can never signify the *Universal*, as in the *Universal* there is no diversity* (which would require specialisation by means of such qualifying terms as *that which stands* and so forth), and inasmuch as what is diverse is the *Individual* substance, the said sentence should be taken as referring to this latter (b) The expression '*group of Cows*' presupposes diversity, and as such must refer to the *Individual* things, and not to the *Universal*, which is one only† (c) In the expression he gives the Cow to the *Va dya*, the giving must be of an *Individual* Cow, and not of the *Universal*, as this latter has no body and as such cannot be transferred from one person to another (d) '*Possession*' consists in becoming related to proprietary right it is expressed by such words as '*Kaundinya's cow*,' '*the Brāhmana's cow*' and so forth, and these latter must refer to the *individual* things, as it is only these that are diverse, and as such can belong to, be possessed by, different persons while the *Universal* is one only (and as such cannot belong to several persons) (e) '*Number*' We have such expressions as '*ten cows*,' '*twenty cows*' etc., and these must refer to the *Individual* things—as these alone are diverse,—and not to the *Universal* which is one only (f) '*Enlargement*'—It is only an *Individual* thing, which is a product brought about by (constituent) causes, that can undergo '*enlargement*', which consists in the accretion of more and more component particles, as we find expressed in the words '*the cow has grown large*', which cannot refer to the *Universal*, which is not made up of component particles (and as such can have no accretions to it) (g) The same remarks apply to '*contraction*' (h) '*Colour*'—The expressions '*the white cow*,' '*the tawny cow*' and the like must be taken as

* The *Itihāsa* explains *abhedat* as 'because the agent of standing and sitting is one and the same'. But this is not compatible with the context

† The *Viz* text omits the words गवा गमुह इति मेदाद् द्रव्याभिधानेन नैव पानेरेवेति which are found in all *Mss*

referring to the presence of the particular quality of Colour in the individual thing, and not to the *Universal*. (i) 'Compounding'—such compounds as 'gohita' (*welfare of the cow*), 'gosukha' (*comfort of the cow*) must refer to the connection* of welfare and comfort with the individual thing, and not with the *Universal*. (j) 'Procreation'—i.e. reproduction of likes, the expression 'the cow produces cows' must refer to individuals, as it is these that are produced, and not to the *Universal*, which (being eternal) is never produced. Throughout this context the word 'draṣya' is synonymous with 'vyakti'.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The next *Sūtra* puts forward the refutation of the above described Individualistic Theory—

Sūtra 61

This is not right, as there could be no restriction —

BHĀṢYA

The *Individual* cannot be denoted by the Word. Why? *Because there could be no restriction* — As a matter of fact, the word 'Cow' denotes that which is qualified by the terms 'that which' and the rest (mentioned in *Su* 57). That is to say, in such expressions as 'that cow which is standing', 'that cow which is seated', what is denoted by the word 'Cow' is not the mere *Individual* by itself, without any qualifications, and as apart from the *Universal* (to which it belongs),—but the *Individual* as qualified by (and along with) the *Universal*. Hence it is not right to say that the Words denote *Individuals*. Similarly in the case of the terms 'group etc', (mentioned in *Su* 57)

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[*The Individualist objects*]—'If the *Individual* is not denoted by the Word, how is it that the Word is applied to it?' "

Our answer is that we find in actual usage that for certain reasons one thing is spoken of as another, even though it is not usually the same as the latter. [For instance]—

Sūtra 62

In the case of—(a) *brāhmana*', (b) '*manca*' ('platform'), (c) '*kaṭa*' ('mat'), (d) '*rājan*' ('king'), (e) '*śaktu*' ('flour'), (f) '*can-*

* मयोगो is the right reading as in the *Purī* Ms.

dana' ('sandal'), (g) 'gāṅgā', (h) 'sāṭaka' ('cloth'), (i) 'anna', ('food'), (j) 'puruṣa' ('man'),—there is secondary (indirect) application, due respectively to—(a) association, (b) location, (c) purpose, (d) behaviour, (e) measure, (f) containing, (g) proximity, (h) connection, (i) cause and (j) sovereignty *

What is meant by 'one thing being spoken of as another which is not the same as that' is that a thing is spoken of by means of a word which is not directly expressive of it † For example—(a) In the expression 'yastīkām bhōjaya', 'feed the stick', the word 'yastīkī', 'stick', is applied to the *Brāhmaṇa* accompanied by (carrying) the stick, by reason of 'association',—(b) in the expression 'mañcūḥ krośanti' 'the platforms are shouting' the word 'mañca', 'platform', is applied to the *men* upon the platform, by reason of 'location', (c) when *grass* is being collected for the making of the mat, the man is said to be *making the mat*, [where the word 'mat' is applied to the *grass*] on account of the 'purpose' (for which the grass is collected),—(d) the expressions 'yama-rāja', 'this king is the Death Deity', 'kaveṛo rāja' 'this king is the Wealth-Deity', the words 'Yama', 'Death Deity' and 'kaveṛa', 'Deity of wealth', are applied to the *King*, by reason of his 'behaviour' (resembling that of the Deities),—(e) when the *flour* is weighed by means of the particular measure of 'five pounds' we use the expression 'five pound-flour,' [where the word 'flour' is applied to the *five pounds*] by reason of its being the 'measure' (of weight),—(f) when sandal is held in the balance it is called the 'balance sandal,' [where the word sandal is applied to the

* In connection with this Sūtra it may be noted that among the words enumerated, the first, *Brāhmaṇa* is that to which the figurative term *yogī* is applied, while all the rest are those that are figuratively applied to things other than those directly denoted by them

But this remark applies to the Sūtra only in view of the way in which the *Bhāṣya* explains the case and the example it has chosen to cite. We may however cite the instance of the case where a man who is not a *Brāhmaṇa* if he is found to be always in the company of *Brāhmaṇas*, comes to be regarded as a *Brāhmaṇa*. In view of this example the Sūtra becomes quite relevant

† The reading of the *Viz* text is corrupt. The right reading is द्योतकत्वं तत्र शब्देनाभिधानमिति, as found in the *Purī* Mss. and also in the *Varāṇsi* and the *Bhāṣya* and the *Bhāṣya*

balance] by reason of 'containing',—(g) in the expression 'the cows are grazing in the Gangā,' the word 'Gangā' is applied to the *adjoining lands*, by reason of 'proximity',—(h) when the cloth coloured black is called 'black', we have the word 'black' applied to the *cloth*, by reason of 'connection',—(i) in the expression 'food is life', (the word 'life' is applied to the *food*) by reason of its being the 'cause' (of life),—(j) in the expressions 'this man is the dynasty', 'this man is the race', (the words 'dynasty' and 'race' are applied to the *man*) by reason of his 'sovereignty or predominance'

Now, in the case in question (i.e. of the ordinary noun 'cow' e.g.) what happens is that the word really denotative of the *Universal* is applied to the *Individual*, by reason of either 'association' or 'connection'

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

(B) [*The 'Configuration' theory is next put forward*]—If the Individual cannot form the denotation of the word 'Cow', then—

Sūtra 63

"It may be the 'Ākṛti', 'Configuration', [that is denoted by the Word], as the determining of the exact nature of a thing is dependent upon that —

BHĀṢYA

"*The Configuration of a thing must be what is denoted by the word ('Cow') Why? Because the determining of the exact nature of a thing is dependent upon that 'The Configuration' of a thing consists in the particular disposition (or arrangement) of its component parts and of the component particles of those parts, and it is only when this has been duly recognised that the exact nature of the thing becomes determined as to its being a cow or a horse,—this determining not being possible until the Configuration of the thing has been duly recognised, and the Word can be taken as denotative of only that the recognition whereof leads to the determining of the exact nature of the thing spoken of.*"

[*The answer to this 'Configuration' theory is as follows]—This is not possible because as a matter of fact what happens is that a thing is spoken of as the 'cow', as being qualified by the

* This answer the *Bhāṣyacandra* remarks is from the standpoint of the Individualist

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, the manifestation (or recognition) of the Universal depends upon Configuration and Individuality. That is, unless the Individuality and the Configuration have been apprehended, there is no apprehension of the Universal, purely by itself. Hence the Universal (by itself) cannot constitute the denotation of a Word.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

*But with all this, it is not possible that the Word has no denotation at all, so the question arises—what is the denotation of the Word? [The answer is given in the next Sūtra]

[(D) *The Final Siddhanta View of 'Composite' Denotation*]

Sūtra 66

In reality, the Individual, the Configuration and the Universal (all three) constitute the denotation of the Word

BHĀṢYA

The term 'tu', 'in reality', serves the purpose of emphasis, "What is it that is emphasised?" What is meant to be emphasised is that all the three are denoted by words,—there being no hard and fast rule as to which one is the predominant and which the subordinate factor. For instance, when there is (on the part of the person pronouncing the word) a desire to lay stress upon the difference (of a thing from others)—and when the cognition brought about is also one pertaining to the distinctive features of that thing—then the 'Individual' forms the predominant factor (in the denotation of that word), and the 'Universal' and the 'Configuration' are subordinate factors,† when, on the other hand, the difference is not meant to be emphasised,—and the resultant cognition also pertains to the commonalities,—then the 'Universal' is the predominant factor,‡ and the 'Individual' and the 'Configuration' are subordinate factors. Many instances (of such varying predominance and subservience) may be found in

* This serves to introduce the final Siddhanta—says the Bhāṣyaśāstra

† When, for instance, we say 'the cow is standing'—Bhāṣyaśāstra

‡ When, for instance, we say 'the cow is eternal'—Bhāṣyaśāstra

actual usage. An example of the predominance of 'Configuration' may also be found *

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

"How is it known that the Individual, the Configuration and the Universal are distinct entities?"

We know this from the fact that each has a distinctive character of its own. For instance—

Sūtra 67

The 'Individual' is that composite material body which is the receptacle of distinctive qualities

[Or, according to the *Vārtika*,—The Individual consists of the specific Quantities, Actions and the Substance containing these.]

BHĀṢYA

The Individual is called '*vyakti*' because it is manifested, rendered perceptible (*vyajyate*), by the external organs of perception. Every substance is not an 'individual', that substance alone is called 'Individual' which is a '*mūrti*'—a material body, so called because it is '*mūrchatāvayava*,' composed of parts—and which, according to circumstances, is the receptacle of the distinctive particular qualities of [Odour, Taste, Colour and] Touch [as enumerated in Sūtra 3-1-61], Gravity, Solidity, Fluidity and Faculty, and of the non-pervasive (limited) Dimension †

Sūtra 68

'Configuration' is that which indicates the Universal and its Characteristics

* When for instance, one says 'make Cow of flour'—where the configuration of the cow is what is meant by the word 'cow'

The *Tatparya* has a long note against the view that of the Universal and the Individual, only one is directly denoted, the other is only indirectly indicated

† The *Tatparya* remarks that this definition of Individual is meant for those things that combine all these—Individuality, Configuration and Universal. Hence there is no harm if the definition given does not apply to such substances as *Ākāśa*, for *Ākāśa* has no Configuration. This is what the *Bhāṣya* means when it says that Every Substance is not an 'individual'.

It is interesting to note that the *Vārtika* is not satisfied with the *Bhāṣya* interpretation of the *Sūtra*, and therefore puts forward another explanation

the pillars' [where what is spoken of as the Instrument, i.e., the *Roots* or the *Pillars*, is a component part of the Agent, the *Tree* or the *House*], and (2) in the other, we have a thing designated by something totally different from it, i.e., 'one cuts the tree with the axe', 'he sees with the lamp' [where the instrument *Axe* or *Lamp*, is something entirely different from the *Cutter* or the *Seer*],—now with regard to the Soul there are such designations as, 'he sees with the eye', 'he cognises with the mind', 'he ponders with the intellect', 'he experiences pleasure and pain with the body', and in connection with this, it is uncertain whether in these we have the designation of the Aggregate or Composite of Body, Intellect &c by means of its components [i.e., the Body &c spoken of as Instruments are only the component parts of the *Experiencer*, *Seer* &c, which is thus only an Aggregate of the Body &c], or the designation of one thing (the *Seer* &c), by means of things different from it [i.e., the Body &c spoken of as Instruments are different from the *Experiencer* *Seer*, &c]

Our opinion is that in these expressions we have the designation (of the Agent) by something different from itself [i.e., the Soul is different from the Body &c]

"Why -o?"

[The answer is supplied by the Sutra (1)]

Sutra 1

Because the same thing is apprehended by Sight and by Touch

BHĀṢYA

[As a matter of fact, we find that it often happens that] one thing having been apprehended by Sight, that same thing is apprehended by Touch also, [the idea in the mind of the perceiver being] 'that thing which I saw with my eyes I now touch with the organ of touch', or 'that which I touched with the organ of touch I now see with my eyes', which means that the latter idea recognises, or recalls, the two perceptions as apprehending one and the same object and having (belonging to) one and the same Agent,—and thus one agent cannot be either the *Composite* or *Aggregate* [composed of the Body and the Sense-organs] or the

Sense-organ]* Hence that Agent—who is the apprehender (perceiver) of the said one thing by Sight and by Touch, and who (in the manner shown above) recognises the two perceptions as apprehending the same object, as having an Agent and as brought about by different Instruments —is something† entirely different (from the Composite or the Sense organ) and this is the *Soul*!

‘Why cannot the two perceptions be regarded as having their ‘one Agent’ in the shape of the *Sense-organ*?’

A Sense organ can recognise or recall only that apprehension which has been brought about by itself and not the apprehension of another thing brought about by another Sense organ

“Why cannot the two perceptions be regarded as having their ‘one agent’ in the *Composite or Aggregate*?”

As a matter of fact the Agent must be one who remains the same, while cognising (recalling) two such perceptions as have been brought about by two different Instruments (i.e. Sense organs) and belong to (i.e. have been accomplished by the Agency of) that same Agent himself and certainly the *Aggregate* cannot be such an Agent

‘Why?’

Because what we urged above in connection with Sense organs—that one Sense organ cannot recall the apprehension brought about by another Sense organ —does not cease to apply, with equal force to the case of the *Aggregate* also

Sūtra 2

[Says the Opponent]—“What has been put forward in the preceding Sūtra is not right for there is restriction as to objects §

* Because the Agent must be different from the Instrument —says the *Bhāṣya*—That is to say the Sense-organ being the Instrument in the Perception cannot be the Agent of that perception nor can the Composite or Aggregate be the Agent as the Sense organ which is the Instrument, forms a component of that Composite and the Instrument must be quite different from the Agent

† Something *bhūta* here stands for a *real thing* something vouched for by Valid means of cognition.—*Bhāṣya*

§ Sū (1) has put forward the fact of Recognition as proving the conclusion that the perceiver is the Soul something different from the Body and the Sense organs &c In this second Sūtra the Opponent while admitting the

the pillars' [where what is spoken of as the Instrument, *i e*, the *Roots or the Pillars*, is a component part of the Agent, the Tree or the House], and (2) in the other, we have a thing designated by something totally different from it, *i e*, 'one cuts the tree with the axe', 'he sees with the lamp' [where the instrument Axe or Lamp, is something entirely different from the Cutter or the Seer],—now with regard to the Soul there are such designations as, 'he sees with the eye', 'he cognises with the mind', 'he ponders with the intellect', 'he experiences pleasure and pain with the body', and in connection with this, it is uncertain whether in these we have the designation of the Aggregate or Composite of Body, Intellect &c by means of its components [*i e*, the Body &c spoken of as Instruments are only the component parts of the *Experiencer*, Seer &c, which is thus only an Aggregate of the Body &c], or the designation of one thing (the Seer &c), by means of things different from it [*i e*, the Body &c spoken of as Instruments are different from the Experiencer Seer &c]

Our opinion is that in these expressions we have the designation (of the Agent) by something different from itself [*i e*, the Soul] is different from the Body &c]

"Why so?"

[The answer is supplied by the Sutra (1)]

Sutra 1

Because the same thing is apprehended by Sight and by Touch

BHĀŚYA

[As a matter of fact, we find that it often happens that] one thing having been apprehended by Sight, that same thing is apprehended by Touch also, [the idea in the mind of the perceiver being] 'that thing which I saw with my eyes I now touch with the organ of touch', or 'that which I touched with the organ of touch I now see with my eyes', which means that the latter idea recognises, or recalls, the two perceptions as apprehending one and the same object and having (belonging to) one and the same Agent,—and this one agent cannot be either the Composite or Aggregate [composed of the Body and the Sense-organs] or the

Sense-organ]* Hence that Agent—who is the apprehender (perceiver) of the said one thing by Sight and by Touch and who (in the manner shown above) recognises the two perceptions as apprehending the same object as having an Agent and as brought about by different Instruments—is something† entirely different (from the Composite or the Sense organ) and this is the Soul

Why cannot the two perceptions be regarded as having their one Agent in the shape of the *Sense organ*?

A Sense organ can recognise or recall only that apprehension which has been brought about by itself and not the apprehension of another thing brought about by another Sense organ

Why cannot the two perceptions be regarded as having their one agent in the *Composite* or *Aggregate*?

As a matter of fact the Agent must be one who remains the same while cognising (recalling) two such perceptions as have been brought about by two different Instruments (i.e. Sense organs) and belong to (i.e. have been accomplished by the Agency of) that same Agent himself and certainly the *Aggregate* cannot be such an Agent

Why?

Because what we urged above in connection with Sense organs—that 'one Sense organ cannot recall the apprehension brought about by another Sense-organ—does not cease to apply, with equal force to the case of the *Aggregate* also

Sūtra 2

[Says the Opponent]—What has been put forward in the preceding Sūtra is not right for there is restriction as to objects §

* Because the Agent must be different from the Instrument—says the *Bhāṣyacandra*. That is to say the Sense organ being the Instrument in the perception cannot be the Agent of that perception nor can the Composite or Aggregate be the Agent as the Sense organ which is the Instrument forms a component of that Composite and the Instrument must be quite different from the Agent

† something *bhūta* here stands for a *real thing* something vouched for by Valid means of cognition.—*Bhāṣyacandra*

§ Su (1) has put forward the fact of Recognition as proving the conclusion that the perceiver is the Soul something different from the Body and the Sense organs &c. In the second Sūtra the Opponent while admitting the

"The intelligent Perceiver need not be something different from the Composite of the Body etc — 'Why?' — *Because there is restriction as to objects*. That is, the Sense organs are restricted in the scope of things (perceived by their instrumentality), e.g., Colour is not perceived without the Visual Organ, while it is perceived when the Visual Organ is there, and when between two things it is found that one appears while the other exists and does not appear when the other does not exist—it follows that one is of (belongs to) the other,* hence the perception of Colour must be regarded as belonging to the Visual Organ, that is *it is the Visual Organ that perceives the Colour*. Similarly in the case of the Olfactory and other organs. Thus then, inasmuch as it is the Sense-organs that perceive their respective objects these (and not anything else) should be regarded as the *Intelligent Perceiver*, for the simple reason that the presence and absence of the Perception of objects is found to be in strict accordance with the presence and absence of the Sense-organs. Such being the case, what is the use of postulating a distinct Intelligent Being (in the shape of 'Soul')?"

† The answer to the above is that the premiss put forward being doubtful, the reasoning becomes fallacious. What has been put forward is the fact of the presence and absence of Perceptions being in accordance with the presence and absence of the Sense-organs, but it is open to doubt whether this fact is due to the

fact of Recognition demurs to the conclusion the sense being that Recognition does not necessarily prove the existence of something different from the Sense-organs for even if such a Soul were there it would not be omniscient it could perceive only a few things not all, and as such it would be limited in its scope in the same manner as the Sense-organs are. What advantage then can be gained by postulating a distinct entity in the shape of 'Soul' — *Parīśuddhi*.

This is somewhat different from the explanation in the *Bhāṣya*.

* So that in the case in question when it is found that Perception appears while the Sense-organ exists and does not appear while the organ does not exist—it follows that the Perception belongs to the Sense organ, i.e. the Sense organ is the *perceiver* — *Tatparya*.

† The *Parīśuddhi* remarks that this answer is to the *Purvapakṣa* argument presented in the *Bhāṣya*, the answer to the argument in 3.1.2 is given in 3.1.3. The *Bhāṣya* and *śāstra* say that this is the Bhāṣyakara's own answer to the *Purvapakṣa* argument.

Sense-organs being the intelligent perceivers, or to their being mere instruments belonging to another Intelligent Perceiver, and thus being the causes of the said Perceptions, the said fact can certainly be accounted for also as being due to the Sense organs being *causes* of Perceptions, even though only as *Instruments* belonging to an Intelligent perceiver *

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

As regards the argument urged (in Su 2)—“because there is restriction as to objects”—the answer is—

Sūtra 3

It is because there is restriction as to objects that there must be a Soul, hence this cannot be denied †

If there were no ‘restriction’ in regard to the objects perceived by any single Sense-organ [and that alone were to perceive all objects], this would mean that that Sense organ apprehending all objects is the omniscient and intelligent Perceiver, and (under the circumstances) who could ever infer the existence of any intelligence apart from the said organ? So that, it is because there is restriction as to objects apprehended by the several Sense-organs that we are led to infer the existence of an intelligent Agent, distinct from the Sense organs, who is free from the said ‘restriction as to objects’, and (hence) omniscient, (i.e. capable of perceiving the objects perceptible by *all* Sense organs) We now put forward instances representing the functioning of the Intelligent Agent, which irresistibly point to the said conclusion (that the Intelligent Agent is distinct from the

* All that the fact of the presence and absence of one thing being in accordance with the presence and absence of another thing, proves is that the latter is the *cause* of the former, and it cannot prove any such conclusion as that the latter is the *intelligent agent* of the former or that there can be no other intelligent agent — *Bhāṣyacandra*

† There is restriction as to objects —one organ brings about the perception of only a few objects not of all —this shows that the organs must be *non intelligent*, this therefore renders it necessary to postulate the existence of the Soul as the intelligent agent operating on the organs. Hence what has been urged by the Opponent in proof of the Organs being the intelligent agents, points to a conclusion entirely to the contrary — *Tatparya and Bhāṣyacandra*

Sense organs) *—(a) The Intelligent Agent, on perceiving Colour (of a certain fruit for instance) infers the Odour and Taste which he has perceived in the past, or on perceiving its Odour, he infers its Colour and Taste; and so on in regard to other objects —(b) then again, having (at one moment) seen the Colour, he smells (at another moment) the Odour, or having smelt the Odour, he sees the Colour, all which goes to show that the Perceiver recalls (and reviews) the perception of all objects, without any fixed order of sequence, and all this Perception subsists in (belongs to) one Intelligent Agent,† and not to anything else (in the shape of the Body or the Sense-organs &c), and this is so not only in connection with perception through the senses but the same Perceiver also recalls and recognises various such cognitions as *Perceptual*, *Inferential*, *Verbal* and *Doubtful* bearing upon several objects, e.g., (1) he hears the Scriptures, which bear upon all things,—and apprehends the meaning (of the Scriptures), which is not perceptible by the Auditory Organ (by which he hears the syllables pronounced in a certain order),—(2) he reviews and recognises the syllables as forming words and sentences,—(3) and he recalls the laws bearing upon the denotation of the words,—which shows that the single Perceiver cognises a number of several objects which are not capable of being apprehended by any single Sense-organ. Now this 'absence of restriction as to the objects apprehended', which points to a single Perceiver of all things, cannot be turned aside (to prove the intelligence of Sense-organs) § Thus it is found that the assertion—'the Sense-organs being the intelligent Agents, what is the use of postulating a distinct intelligent Agent?'—is not right

* The *Vit.* text reads प्रत्यभिज्ञानम्, which does not suit the context the *Taittiriya* and the *Bhāṣya* both read, अभिज्ञानम्. The *Taittiriya* connects the two clauses तत्रेदमभिज्ञानमप्रत्यक्षैवम् and येन तदनुभूतिरिति as one sentence, this is what we have followed in the translation. The *Bhāṣya* takes the two separately, according to this the translation would run thus 'What has been just said irresistibly points to the conclusion that the Soul is some thing quite distinct, and we now proceed to take an instance of the functioning of the Intelligent Agent

† As is shown by such well recognised notions as—"I, who had seen the Colour, now smell the Odour"—*Bhāṣya*.

§ The *Bhāṣya* reads व्यवस्था (or अव्यवस्था) and explains it as 'distinctive feature' the passage in that case would mean that the aforesaid distinctive feature of the all-perceiving Agent cannot be attributed to the 'sense-organs'

SECTION (2)

[Sūtras 4-6]

The Soul is distinct from the Body

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

*For the following reason also the Aggregate of Body &c , can not be the Soul , the Soul is something different from these —

Sūtra 4

[If the Body were the Soul, then] there would be no sin accruing from the burning (killing) of a living Body †

* The *Parīśuddh* introduces this cation as follows. The first cation having established the conclusion that the Soul is something distinct from the sense organs, some people might urge the following argument. 'We admit that, being restricted as to their Objects the Sense-organs cannot be regarded as *intelligent*, but the Body could very well be regarded as the intelligent Agent because there is no such restriction in regard to the Body, as is vouched for by such notions as I *who am fat and fast* am now in my old age, teaching what I had seen in my youth [where *fatness, fairness, oldness and youth*, all belong to the *Body*], which shows that the *Siddhanta* argument put forward in Sū. (1) is applicable to the Body.

It is with a view to meet these people that the Author proceeds with this second section.

† The *Bhāṣya* *candra* construes the Sūtra thus—(a) the term *Sarīradāhe* may be taken to mean *the burner of body, Sarīradāh ke*, or as *Sarīradāhe satī tathakartā*, on the burning of the body, to the person doing the burning.

The *Parīśuddh* remarks that burning here stands for *destroying* *killing*, and 'sin' for all such qualities as would be capable of producing their results in the future, the sense of the argument being that if the Body were the Soul, then there could be no such things as *Merit* and *Demerit*, qualities which are believed to subsist in the Soul, only with a view to account for the experiences of our present life, which are believed to be the results of the *Merit* and *Demerit* accumulated by us during our previous existences. If the Body were the Soul, it must perish at death hence it could have no such qualities attaching to it as would continue in future lives, when the time for the retribution of those qualities would come, and thus the theory that the Body is the Soul would do away with all notions of *Dharma* and *Adharma*.

The *Tātparya* remarks that this argument can have no force against the thorough going Materialist, who admits of no *Dharma* and *Adharma*, but it will be effective against the *Bauddhas*, who, while denying the Soul, do admit of *Dharma* and *Adharma*.

‡ That the above is the sense of the arguments propounded in the Sūtra is clear from what follows in Sū. 5 *et. seq.* If Sū. 4 had stood alone, it

The term 'Body' here stands for the 'living creature,' the Aggregate of Body, Sense-organs, Intellects and Sensations. When this 'Body' of a living creature is burnt by a person, there accrues to him the 'Sin' of killing a living creature, and it is this sin that is called (in the Sūtra) 'pātaka', 'sin',—there could be no connection between such 'sin' and the Agent who did the act,* and what the 'Sin' would be connected with [i.e., to whom its results would accrue] would not be the Agent who did the act. For (according to the Opponent) the Agent being nothing more than an Aggregate or Composite, a series of (momentary) Bodies, Sense-organs, Intellects and Sensations, the Composite or Aggregate that is destroyed (disappears) at one moment must be totally different from that which appears at the next, and inasmuch as you regard the 'series' as consisting of mere appearances and disappearances, you cannot get rid of the fact that (according to you) there is a difference (between the two Aggregates in the series); as the Aggregate of Body and the rest [which appears later] would be the substratum of difference [from that which has gone before],† for (according to you) this later Aggregate is held to be quite different (from the preceding Aggregates)‡

would have been much simpler to explain it as— If the Body were the Soul then the burning of the dead body would involve a sin, but as a matter of fact it does not, hence the Body cannot be the Soul, or as—'the body having been burnt away after death, nothing in the shape of *Dharma* or *Adharma* could remain behind to lead to re-birth.'

* As the Body, which is the only Agent, has according to the Opponent ceased to exist the very moment that the act has been done, so that it does not exist at the time that the 'sin' manifests itself or its results. The results of sin accrue to a person after death, or at a time other than that at which the act has been done, according to the Opponent, the Body being the only Agent, and it having only a momentary existence, to whom could the sin or its results accrue? Hence the 'sin' cannot be regarded as subsisting in the Agent, this says the *Bhāṣyacandra*, is what is meant by the phrase 'there could be no sin.'

† That which appears later being that to whom the Sin and its results would accrue, that which has gone before being that by which the act was done.—*Bhāṣyacandra*.

‡ The *Bhāṣyacandra* reads अनन्वविधि etc., according to which the passage would mean— Though such is your view yet as a matter of fact, the Aggregate to whom the results accrue is actually recognised to be the substratum of non-difference from the preceding Aggregate. But by the

Such being the case (according to your view), that creature consisting of the Aggregate of the Body etc who does the *killing*, does not have any connection with the result of that killing, and what is connected with the result is not that by whom the killing was done * So that, the two (the *doer* and the *experiencer of results*) being entirely different, it comes to this that one (the preceding 'Aggregate') who did the act becomes dissociated from what he did (and from its consequences), while one (the later Aggregate) who did not do the act becomes saddled with it (and its consequences) And if the said 'Creature' is one that is liable to birth and destruction [as it must be, being only an Aggregate of the Body etc] the birth of such a 'creature' could not (according to the view of the Opponent) be due to his past actions † and this would mean that there can be no point in leading the life of a 'Religious Student' for the purposes of Release (from birth and rebirth) ‡

Thus then it is found that if the living creature were only an Aggregate of Body etc there would be no sin accruing from the killing of a living body, and this certainly is most undesirable, from which it follows that the Soul must be something different from the Aggregate of Body etc

interposing of this remark the connection between the presentation of the Opponent's views and the contingency urged in the Sūtra and pointed out in the next sentence of the Bhasya—एव सिद्धि &c —becomes lost

* This says the *Vartika* is put forward not as a proof of the Soul but only as indicating the objectionable feature in the theory of those who deny the Soul

† The only plausible explanation of the birth of man and the diversity of his conditions during life is that all this is due to the necessary consequence of his acts during previous lives. If the 'man' is only a bundle of body, organs etc this explanation would lose its value as this bundle &c is found to perish entirely at death so that one to whom the conditions of next birth would accrue would not be that same 'bundle' which did the acts leading up to those conditions

‡ According to the Buddha if one wishes to be released from rebirth he should lead the pure life of the Religious Student. But if the man is nothing more than the bundle of body &c his existence would naturally come to an end with his death and this would be a total Release from Rebirth, as the Body &c born subsequently will in no case, be the same as the preceding ones. Why then should one undergo the rigorous discipline of the Religious Student?

Sūtra 5

[The Opponent says]—"Even on the burning of that [aggregate of Body etc.] which is accompanied by the Soul there could be no sin, as the Soul is something eternal"

BHĀṢYA

"Even for him, according to whom what is burnt is the Body endowed with a Soul, no sin could accrue, from the act of burning, to the burner 'Why?' Because the Soul (postulated by him) is eternal; and certainly no one can ever kill what is eternal. If it could be killed, it would not be eternal. So that, while according to one theory (that there is no such thing as Soul) the killing (not being sinful) does not lead to anything,—according to the other (that there is such a thing as Soul, and it is eternal), killing is impossible."

Sūtra 6

[The answer of the Siddhāntin to the Opponents' arguments in Sū 5]—Not so; (A) because the 'killing' is of the receptacle of effects and of that which brings about those effects—[(B) Or because the 'killing' is of the receptacle of effects which is what brings about those effects].*

(A) What we say is, not that 'Killing' consists in destroying the eternal entity, but that it consists in the destroying of the

* The Bhāṣya has supplied two explanations of the Sūtra the difference being due to the different ways of construing the compound कर्त्तृव्यवस्तु. Under (A) it is treated as a Dvandva, which gives the meaning 'the receptacle of effects'—i.e., the Body—and that which brings about the effects—i.e., the Sense-organs; while under (B) the compound is treated as Karmadhāraya—the sense being—'the receptacle of effects, which is what brings about those effects'—the Body.

The Nyāyaśāstratīkāra reads the Sūtra as कर्त्तृव्यवस्तुनाशः—and explains it to mean that the killing of the body does not do away with the Unseen Force; 'effect' in the Sūtra standing for the 'Unseen Force of Merit and Demerit'—the 'receptacle' अव्यय and 'bringer about' कर्त्तृ of that Force is the Soul, and there is नाशः—i.e., non-destruction of that Soul. It adds that the Sūtra cannot mean that 'It is not right to say that there can be no sin even on the 'Killing of the Body' with a Soul, as there is Destruction of the Soul, which is the bringer about, कर्त्तृ, of the connection, अव्यय, of the Body, कर्त्तृ."

Vidyamāhārī accepts the second (B) explanation given in the Bhāṣya.

'receptacle of effects'—i.e., *Body*—and of 'that which brings about those effects', in the shape of the apprehension of their respective objects—i.e., the *Sense organs*,—both of these (*Body* and *Sense organs*) belonging to a living entity which, by its very nature, is indestructible, and this 'destroying' takes the form of *striking* or *causing pain*, i.e., *disorganising*, by *bringing death* or by *tearing out of its bearings** 'Effect' here stands for the *feeling of pleasure and pain*, and of this the *Body* is the 'receptacle': i.e., the abode, the substratum,—and the *Sense organs* are 'those that bring about' the apprehension of their objects—and it is the destroying of both these (as belonging to the *Soul*) that constitutes 'Killing', and not that of the eternal *Soul* itself. Consequently what has been urged by the opponent in Sutra 5—that "there could be no sin even on the burning of that which is accompanied by the *Soul*, as the *Soul* is something eternal"—is not right.

It is only the person holding the view that 'Killing' consists in destroying the entity itself that is open to the charge that his theory involves the absurdity of an act being destroyed (ineffective) for him who did it, and falling upon him who did not do it (as urged in the *Bhāṣya* above).

In regard to the point at issue there are two alternative theories—viz (a) the 'Killing' consists in the total destroying of the entity itself, or (b) that it consists in the destroying of the 'receptacle of effects and that which brings about the effects',—these two belonging to the entity which is itself indestructible,—there can be no third alternative. Of these the view that there is destruction of the entity itself has been negatived, what remains is the other view, which has been found to be true (in ordinary experience).

(B) [The *Bhāṣya* puts forward a second explanation of the Sutra] We can also construe the term '*Kāryāśrayakartṛadhāt*' as follows—'*Kāryāśraya*', 'the receptacle of effects', is the aggregate made up of the *Body*, the *Sense organs* and *Intellect*—

* Bringing death refers to the *Body*, and 'tearing out of its bearings' to the *Sense organ*. '*Pr bandhrochedh*' is explained by the *Bhāṣyacandra* as 'destroying its connections', *sambandhrochedh*, and the *Tatparya* adds that one causes pain by striking the *Body*, as also by tearing the *Eye* out of its sockets.

because it is in this aggregate that the eternal Soul feels pleasure and pain, it forms its *abode* 'receptacle', because it is only in the said Aggregate, and in nothing else, that the feeling appears;—this same aggregate is also regarded as the '*Kartr*', the 'bringer about', of the feeling, as it is by reason of, through, the said Aggregate—and never without it—that the feeling comes about,—and it is the striking or causing pain or disorganising of this Aggregate that constitutes 'killing', and not the destroying of the eternal Soul. Hence what has been urged in Sūtra 5—that "there could be no sin even on the killing of the body accompanied by the Soul, because the Soul is eternal"—is not true*.

SECTION 3

Sūtras 7-14

[*Refutation of the View that the Visual Organ is one only*]

* The Aggregate of Body &c, is called the 'receptacle' in the sense that it is as favourable to the appearing of the feeling as the very container of the feeling. It is called *Kartr* the bringer about of the feeling in the sense that it forms an agency in the bringing about of the feeling.—*Bhāṣya-sādhya*

† There is much confusion in regard to this section. As a matter of fact up to Sū. 27 we have the same *prakaraṇa* dealing with the Soul and proving by a number of reasonings that the Soul cannot be the same as either the Body or the Sense organs or the Mind or a mere aggregate of all these. But Commentators have made subdivisions of the *prakaraṇa* in view of the nature of the arguments put forward. Hence the *Nyāyasūcī-bardha* makes one *prakaraṇa* of Sūtras 1-14 wherein it is shown that the Visual Organ is not one, but two and hence the Soul which is one cannot be this or any other organ. So also the *Tātparjya* and the *Bhāṣya-sādhya* though the latter is not very precise as to its *prakaraṇa*-divisions and deals with the whole subject of the Soul being distinct from the Body &c as under a single *prakaraṇa* but in its explanations it accepts the same stages as the *Nyāyasūcī-bardha* and the *Tātparjya*.

The footnote in the Viz. *Bhāṣya* text asserts that the *Vārtika* does not accept the *Bhāṣya* interpretation of this *prakaraṇa*. It says that the fact of the Soul being something different from the Sense-organs having been already established there could be no point in introducing the same subject over again hence it offers another explanation—taking Sūtras 7 to 11 as embodying the view that the Visual Organ is one only.

The *Bhāṣya* proceeds on the basis of the assumption that the organs are two, while the *Vārtika* denies this at the very outset. It is clear that the *Bhāṣya* has been led to proceed on the said assumption by reason of the case with which it supports the argument in favour of a single Soul operating through several organs. According to this view Sū. 7 embodies the argu-

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

For the following reason also the Soul must be regarded as something different from the Body etc —

ment that when we see a thing with one eye on the first occasion, and then subsequently with the other eye, we have the *recognition* of the thing as being the same as that seen on the previous occasion, which shows that there has been a common *perceiver*, and this is Soul—This is answered by the Opponent in Sū 8 by the argument that the Eye is one and the same in the two sockets, hence on both occasions perception being by the same Eye, it is only natural that there is *Recognition*—This is answered in Sū 9 which tries to show that the fact urged in Sū 7 cannot be explained otherwise than on the basis of a single intelligent Soul—Sū 10 contains the Opponent's rejoinder—This is finally disposed of in Sū 11 where it is concluded that the Eyes are *two* not one hence the argument of *Recognition* remains unshaken.

The *Vartika* and Viśvanatha's *Vṛtti* take Sū 7 as embodying only the argument based upon Recognition in general and then object to its introduction on the ground that this matter has already been dealt with in the foregoing Adhikaraṇa.

The *Vartika* and the *Vṛtti* of Viśvanatha take Sūtra 7-11 as put in for the purpose of demolishing the view that the existence of Soul is proved by the fact (urged in Sū 7) that there is recognition by the right eye of what has been seen with the left eye and in course of the refutation of this view there comes in the subject of the Visual organ being one or two. Sūtra 7 is explained by the *Bhāṣya* as also by the *Vartika* as embodying the argument that the existence of Soul is proved by the Recognition urged in Sū 7 but while the *Bhāṣya* and the *Tatparya* and the *Bhāṣyacandra* accept it as Siddhānta and so carry on the Prakaraṇa to Sū 15 (and this appears to be the rational interpretation of the Sūtras as they stand)—the *Vartika* holding to the view that the Visual organ is one only could not accept this interpretation of Sū 7-11. Hence it regards the argument propounded in Sū 7 as put forward simply for being refuted. The *Vartika* propounds this refutation from P 362 L 7 onwards (Bib Ind Edition). In course of this refutation the unity of the Visual organ being put forward, the opponent asks (P 363 L 5) what explanation there is of the ordinary idea that there are *two eyes*—In Sū 8 the *Siddhānta* explains this—This explanation is objected to in Sū 9—The real answer to this objection is given by the *Vartika* in P 363 L 161 et seq—Sū 10 is explained as the answer given by 'some people' the objection urged in Sū 9 and then Sū 11 is explained as refuting this answer of 'some people' as also the original *Purāṇapākṣa*.

The weak points in this interpretation of Sūtras 7-11 by the *Vartika* and the *Vṛtti* are as follow—(1) Nowhere else do we find the Sūtra starting a section with a gratuitous argument in support of the Siddhānta view, simply for refuting it and (2) according to this explanation the author of the Sūtras fails to answer the Opponent's argument in Sū 9, and the only answer that he puts forward (in Sū 10, —) himself refutes in Sū 11.

Sūtra 7

Because there is recognition with the other Eye of what has been seen with the left Eye *

BHĀṢYA

When one applies to, or connects with, the same objects, two Cognitions, which appear at different times (one appearing after the other),—there is what is called 'Recognition' this 'recognition' appearing in the form 'I see now what I had cognised (seen) previously', 'this is that same object', and there is such 'recognition' in a case where the former cognition was with the left eye and the subsequent one with the right eye,—the cognition being in the form 'that same thing which I saw on the previous occasion (with the left eye) I am now seeing (with the right eye)' Now if the Sense-organ itself were the intelligent perceiver, no such 'recognition' would be possible, for what is seen by one cannot be recognised (or remembered) by another. There is no doubt however that there is such 'Recognition'. Hence it follows that the intelligent perceiver is something different from the Sense-organs

Sūtra 8

[Says the Opponent]—"The above reasoning is not right for the Organ (in reality) is one only, and the notion of duality arises from the one Organ being divided by the nasal bone" †

BHĀṢYA

[Says the Opponent]—"As a matter of fact the Visual Organ is one only, it is divided by the nasal bone, and when the two ends (parts) of the organ, thus divided, are perceived, it gives rise

* The conclusion derived from this 'because &c' is that there is a soul who is the agent of the seeing and the recognising. But according to the Nyāyasmūtra it arises the conclusion deduced is that the Visual Organ is one only. See preceding note.

† The Tatparyā says—This Sūtra objects to the reasoning of Sū 7, on the basis of the view that the Visual Organ is one only.—The Bhāṣyastandha says—What the Opponent means to urge in Sū 8 is as follows—What has been urged in Sū 7 would be right if there were two distinct visual organs, but according to our view it is not so for the visual organ is one only.

to the notion that there are two organs, just as it happens in the case of any long object (like the Bamboo, for instance)

Sūtra 9

[Answer]—The Organ cannot be regarded as one only, as (we find that) when one (Eye) is destroyed, the other is not destroyed

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, we find that even when one eye is destroyed, or taken out of its socket, the other eye remains intact, as is clearly indicated by the perception of things (with the remaining eye) * From this it is clear that it is not right to say that a single organ is divided (by the nasal bone)

Sūtra 10

[The Opponent's rejoinder]—‘The argument put forward has no force as even on the destruction of a part the whole is still found (effective)

BHĀṢYA

‘The reasoning,—that ‘because one eye is not destroyed on the destruction of the other eye (therefore the two eyes must be distinct),—is not right, because as a matter of fact, we find that even when some branches of the tree are cut off, the tree itself is actually found standing [Similarly on the theory that the Visual Organ is one only, even when one part of it, in the shape of the one eye is destroyed, the Organ itself will remain intact and effective]’

Sūtra 11

[Answer]—Inasmuch as the example cited is not true [or, inasmuch as the Opponent's view is contrary to perceived facts] the denial (in Sū 10) cannot be right

BHĀṢYA

[The *Bhāṣya* supplies two interpretations of the Sūtra]—(A) [The Opponent has urged, in Sū 10, that the fact of the Visual Organ continuing to be operative even on the destruction of one

* All Mss read विद्यमहन्निद्रम्, which has been adopted in the translation. The Vartika reads विद्यमहन्निद्रम्, which means that the remaining Eye is the *द्रि* the instrument of the perception of things

Eye may be regarded as analogous to the case of the whole tree continuing to remain even when one of its parts, a branch, has been cut off]—As a matter of fact, however, it is not true that the Composite Product continues to exist even when there is disruption of its component particles, for if it did, then it would have to be regarded as eternal (which is absurd) [What really happens in the case of the *Tree*, cited in Su 10, is that] in a case where there are several *composite wholes* (making up a composite object) those wholes are destroyed whose component particles are destroyed, while those continue to exist among whose component particles there is no disruption.*

(B) Or, we may explain the term '*dr̥ṣṭāntavirodhok*' of the Sutra to mean *being contrary to (incompatible with) a perceived fact that is to say*,—(a) in the case of the dead man's skull we find that there are two holes, separated from each other by the nasal bone, in the places where the eyes existed, and quite distinct from each other, this should not be so if there were a single eye simply bifurcated by the nasal bone, (b) *secondly*, as a matter of fact, as it is found that there is no certainty as to the destruction of one eye (necessarily leading or not leading, to the destruction of the other), the two must be regarded as entirely distinct, and inasmuch as the two eyes have their own distinct obstruction and destruction (and the obstruction and destruction of one does not necessarily mean the obstruction and destruction of the other), it follows that they are distinct things, —(c) *thirdly*, when one eye is pressed with the finger there is a divarication or aberration in the contact of the perceived object with the rays of light emanating from the eyes, and (as a consequence) we perceive a diversity in the object, this could not be the case if there were only one Visual Organ, specially as on the cessation

* Several composite wholes go to make up the *Tree*, when a branch is cut off there is disruption of the component parts of this *Tree*, hence the *Tree* cannot but be regarded as destroyed what remains behind is only a part of the *Tree*—one of the several composites that made up the *Tree* it is recognised as the same *Tree*, and not only as its part, because of its similarity to the original tree.—*Bhāṣyatandra*

Hence the case of the *Tree* does not meet the *Siddhānta* argument put forward in Sū 9

of the finger-pressure the object is again perceived as one only.* From all these well known facts it follows that it is not right to regard the organ as one only, simply bifurcated (by the nasal bone)

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA†

That the Intelligent Agent is something distinct from the Aggregate of the Body etc. is also inferred—

* The meaning of this passage, according to the *Bhāṣyacandra* is as follows—‘When we close one eye and press the other with our finger, we see the object, the lamp, as two and when the pressure is removed we perceive the object as one only, or we have the recognition in the form ‘what I saw as two is one only’

But the case meant to be cited appears to have nothing to do with the closing of any eye. It refers to the well known phenomenon that when we look upon a thing with both eyes open in the usual way we perceive it as one, but when we press one eye with the finger we perceive the thing as two, this is due to the fact that in normal vision the rays of light emanating from the eyes coalesce when they fall upon the perceived thing, and this provides a single image of the thing, which comes to be perceived as one but when one eye is pressed with the finger, the rays of light from that eye become diverted from their natural course, and hence fail to coalesce with the rays proceeding from the other eye, so that the light from the eyes not coalescing there are two images of the thing, and it is perceived as two. All this cannot be explained except on the basis of the theory that the two eyes constitute two distinct Visual Organs.

† According to the *Bhāṣya Vartika*, *Tatparjya* and *Bhāṣyacandra*, the Sutra resumes now the subject matter of proofs for regarding the Soul as something different from the Body &c. The *Tatparjya* goes on to remark—‘Having proved, on the strength of Recognition, the soundness of the notion of Soul as something distinct (and also having by the way refuted the theory that the said Recognition can be explained on the basis of the conception that there is only one Visual Organ operating through the two sockets), the Author now proceeds to put forward inferential reasonings in support of the same theory. It should be borne in mind that the Author has, in Sū. 7-11, put forward the phenomenon of recognition in support of his view, simply for the purpose of convincing the opponent, in reality the existence of Soul is proved by ordinary cognitions through Inference &c.

The *Nyāyasūtratīkāraṇa*, which took Sū. 7-11 as putting forward the view that the Visual Organ is one only, takes Sūtra 8-15 also as dealing with the same subject, and according to this the present Sū. (2) means that ‘what happens in the case of men who have lost one eye, is that his former Visual Organ which operated through two physical outlets, is destroyed and another organ is produced, operating through a single opening.’

Sūtra 12

from the excitation appearing in another Sense organ (than the one that brought about the preceding perception)

BHĀṢYA

When a person has tasted a sour fruit and found that its taste is concomitant with a certain colour and smell,—if, at some future time he happens to perceive its colour or smell, by means of a sense-organ (of vision or odour,) there appears an 'excitation' in the organ of Taste, which is totally different (from the organ that has apprehended the colour or smell) that is to say, there is remembrance (through association) of the Taste of the fruit, which gives rise to a longing for that taste, which brings about the flow of the liquid (saliva) from the roots of the teeth. This phenomenon would not be possible if the Sense organs themselves were the Intelligent Agent, as an agent can never remember (or recall) what has been perceived by another *

Sūtra 13

[Objection]—"The above reasoning is not right, Remembrance has for its object that which is remembered"

BHĀṢYA

[Says the Opponent]—"Remembrance is a quality and proceeds from a certain cause,† and its object is that which is remembered, and the 'excitation of the other organ' (put forward in Sūtra 12) is due to the said remembered thing, and not to any such thing as the Soul" §

* The whole process of Inference involved here is thus explained by the *Tātparya*—

The man perceives the colour and smell—he remembers the Taste which he has associated with such colour and smell—he then desires to experience the Taste thus remembered—this desire excites the organ of Taste,—this excitation appearing in the form of the flow of saliva on seeing this excitation appearing in the mouth of a certain person we infer from this that the man has been moved by a desire,—and, from this desire we infer that the man has had a remembrance (of the Taste). This remembrance would not be possible unless there were a single Agent perceiving things through the several sense organs

† This cause consists in the remembered things—adds the *Bhāṣyatandya*

§ We do not admit of the Soul as that in which the Cognition or Remembrance subsists for us the Soul is none other than Cognition itself—such is the sense of the Opponent.—*Bhāṣyatandya*

Sūtra 14

[Answer]—Inasmuch as Remembrance is a quality of the Soul, the denial (of Soul) is not right

BHĀṢYA

Inasmuch as the act of Remembering is found to be such as appears only as a quality subsisting in the Soul the existence of the Soul cannot be denied. As a matter of fact Remembrance is possible only as a quality subsisting in the Soul and certainly one does not remember what has been perceived by another*. If then Intelligence belonged to the Sense organs—inasmuch as the several apprehensions of things would be by diverse agents (in the shape of the Sense organs) either there could be no Recognition at all, or even if Recognition were possible (even when Perception and Remembrance belonged to diverse agents) there could be no restriction as to objects (perceived through the Sense organs) † [there is no such incongruity under the view that there is a single intelligent Agent for all cognitions and remembrance, for] the fact of the matter is that there is one intelligent agent (in whom the cognitions subsist), perceiving the several things through the diverse instrumentality (of the several Sense organs)‡

Remembrance could be regarded as indicating the Soul either as its cause or as its object: the Soul could not be regarded as the cause as the cause of Remembrance is the impression left by its previous cognition nor could the Soul be regarded as the object as the object of Remembrance is the remembered thing. And further since the excitation of the sense organ may be explained as due to the remembered thing it can not prove the existence of the Soul—*Tatparjā*

The *Nyāyasūtrātīkā* explains the Sūtra to mean that all that Remembrance points to is the thing remembered and not to the fact of its being due to the same sense organ that had brought the original cognition.

* Any mere momentary Soul or the mere object jar cannot bring about a remembrance in itself for perception and remembrance cannot appear at the same moment of time—*Bhāṣyacandra*

† There could be no such restriction as that the Eye should apprehend Colour only and not Taste and yet such restriction is accepted by both parties—*Bhāṣyacandra*

‡ The *Bhāṣyacandra* explains *bhūtarūpī* as meaning subsisting in several bodies (during the several lives on Earth). But it appears simpler to take it as above—through the diverse instrumentality of the several sense organs, which the *Bhāṣyacandra* takes as implied in *Anūkarīdāritā*.

—who *remembers* the things *perceived* on some past occasion, so that the existence of Remembrance is possible only as a quality subsisting in the Soul, when perception and recognition both belong to the same Agent, who is capable of perceiving several things, and it is not possible under the contrary theory (of there being no such single Agent) And the entire business of living beings, which is based upon Remembrance indicates the existence of the Soul, the 'excitation of another sense-organ' being cited only by way of illustration

'Further [the assertion of the Opponent cannot be accepted] *because it does not take into account the real object of Remembrance* * As a matter of fact, the assertion in Su 13, that 'Remembrance has for its object the remembered thing'—has been made without due consideration of what forms the real object of Remembrance † As a matter of fact *Remembrance*, which appears at the time when the thing (remembered) is not actually apprehended and which appears in the form—'I knew *that* thing', or 'I had cognized *that* thing', or '*that* thing had been cognized by me, or I had a cognition in regard to *that* thing,—has for its object not merely the *thing* alone by itself but the thing *as previously cognized* and *as along with the notion of the cogniser*, the above fourfold statement, which indicates the exact nature of the object of Remembrance serves one and the same purpose, all of them comprehend the *cogniser* (I), the *previous cognition* (knew before) and the *thing* ('this') §

* The *Uiz* ed prints this as Su 15 But there is no such Sūtra in the *Nyāyasūtrabandha* nor in the *Su* Mss The *Bhāṣya* and *śāstra* also does not treat it as Sūtra and the *Nyāyabūttaravivaraṇa* calls it *Bhāṣyakārtavyam Sūtram* It is only Viśvanātha who reads it as Sūtra

† Having shown above that without Soul there can be no Remembrance the *Bhāṣya* now proceeds to refute the Opponent's assertion that Remembrance has for its object the remembered thing and not the Soul —*Tāt parya*

§ Of the four statements in the second—*jñātarānaḥ samamūrtam* the Cogniser is expressed by the verbal affix in *jñātarān* —in the third *ayamarīko mayājñāti* the thing cognized is expressed by the verbal affix in *jñāta* —in the fourth *diminnarīkē mamājñānamibhu* the act of cognising is expressed by the verbal affix in *jñānam*, and in the first the cogniser is expressed by the conjugational affix in *ajñāsinam* The *Bhā* ya

Then again, as a matter of fact, the Remembrance (or Recognition) that appears in regard to a perceived thing comprehends three cognitions in connection with the same thing, and all these cognitions have the same cognising agent, they do not have several agents, nor are they without agents, they all have one and the same Agent,* [the Recognition of a thing is always in the form] 'What I see now I had seen before', in this the term 'I had seen before' implies *seeing* (in the past), as also the *recalled conception of that seeing*, so that the statement 'I have seen this before' could not be made if the *seeing* referred to were not by that same person (who makes the statement), the statement 'I have seen this before' involves (as we have seen) two conceptions (the *seeing* and the recalled notion of it), and the statement 'what I see now' represents a third conception, thus the single act of Recognition, involving as it does three conceptions, cannot but belong to a single Agent it could not belong to several Agents, nor could it be entirely without an Agent

Thus we find that when the Opponent makes the statement—'there is no Soul, because Remembrance has for its object the remembered thing, (Su 13)—he denies a well-known fact, and loses sight of the real object of Remembrance (as just explained) As we have seen above, the Recognition (expressed by the sentence 'I have seen this before') is not mere 'Remembrance', nor has it for its object the 'remembered thing' only,† in fact it involves a recognition or

uses the singular number in *etadrakyaṃ* in view of the fact that the agent in all is one and the same —*Bhaṣya candra*

All serve the same purpose of indicating the *cogniser*, the *cognition* and the *cognised*—*Tatparāya*

* The preceding passage having shown that the Purvapakṣa view is against verbal usage the Author now shows that it is against a perceptible fact also Here Remembrance 'Smṛti' stands for *Recognition* the name being applied to this latter on the ground of its resemblance to Remembrance —*Bhaṣyacandra*

† The *Bhaṣyacandra* explains this sentence to mean that 'the recognition is not mere Remembrance to *thought* an object nor has it the remembered thing alone for its object' But from what follows, it appears better to take the sentence as translated The *Bhaṣyacandra* has itself pointed out that in the present context the term 'Smṛti' 'Remembrance' generally it adds for 'Recognition' "स्मृत्यन्तर्निविष्टविषय वा" the reading of three Mss and of the *Bhaṣyacandra*, gives better sense

recalling of the direct *cognition* (the present *seeing*) as also of the *remembrance* (of the past *seeing*),—all this belonging to a single cogniser, that is to say, a single cogniser, being cognisant of all the factors (involved in the conception under consideration) recalls the several cognitions as belonging to (and subsisting in) himself, for instance, he it is who has such notions as,—‘I shall cognize such and such a thing’ ‘I am cognising the thing’, ‘I have cognised the thing’, and lastly, not having cognised for a long time, and having an intense desire for cognising it, he comes to have the notion ‘I have discovered the real character of the thing’ [so far in regard to the recognition of the cognition which has been shown to be pertaining to all three points of time] Similarly, the same Agent also recognises or recalls the *Remembrance*, which also pertains to all three points of time and is accompanied by the *desire to remember*

Now if the Being (who is the Agent in all these several cognitions and recognitions) were a mere ‘series of impressions (as the Opponent holds),—inasmuch as every ‘Impression’ would (by its nature) disappear as soon as it has come into existence there could not be a single ‘Impression’ which could do the apprehending of the Cognition and the Remembrance,—which apprehending has been shown to pertain to all three points of time, and without such comprehending (by a single Agent) there could be no Recognition (or Recalling) of Cognition or of Remembrance, and there would be no such conception as ‘I’ (*see, shall see and have seen*) or ‘My’ (*cognition is, was and shall be*), just in the same way as we have no such conceptions (as ‘I’ and ‘Mine’) with regard to the bodies of other persons *

From the above reasons we conclude that there is a single Agent cognising all things and subsisting in all the bodies (with which a person is endowed during his numerous lives on Earth) who recalls, numerous cognitions and remembrances, and by reason of whose absence in the bodies of other persons, there is no recalling (of the cognitions and remembrances of other persons)

* The *Bhāṣyaratna* explains ‘*dehantararat*’ differently, — It should not be forgotten that in the past and present bodies (of an individual) there runs the same Soul. But it appears much simpler to take the phrase as in the translation

SECTION (4)

Sūtras 15-16

The Soul is something different from the Mind

Sūtra 15

[Says the Opponent]—"The Conclusion of the Siddhāntin cannot be accepted, as the reasons adduced in support of the notion of 'Soul' are all applicable to the Mind

DHĀṢYA

"There can be no such thing as Soul distinct from the Aggregate of Body, Mind and the Sense organs, (severally or collectively)*—Why so?—Because the reasons adduced in support of the notion of 'Soul' are all applicable to the Mind Inasmuch as the reasons that have been put forward in Sūtras 3-1-1, et seq., in proof of the existence of the Soul, are applicable to the Mind,—and as a matter of fact, the Mind is actually found capable of apprehending all things,† it follows that the Soul is nothing different from the Aggregate of Body, Sense organs, Mind and Sensation."

Sūtra 16

[Answer] Inasmuch as the instrument of cognition can belong only to the Cogniser, it is merely a difference in names

DHĀṢYA

[The Siddhāntin answers]—It is a well known fact that the Instruments of Cognition belong to the Cogniser,—a fact which is vouched for by such expressions as 'he sees with the eye', 'he smells with the nose', 'he touches with the tactile organ'—Similarly the Mind also is known to be only an 'Instrument', by means of which the Conceiver (the Agent who does the seeing &c with the Visual and other organs) does the conceiving of all things, and on that account this Instrument also operates naturally on all

* The reading देहादिसंघात gives better sense, though the two Purāṇas and the Bhāṣyacandra read simply संघात 'Severally or collectively' has been added by way of explanation by the Bhāṣyacandra

† 'Internal things' like Pleasure, Pain &c and 'external things,' like the Jar and the rest, are all found to be amenable to the cognitive action of the Mind; without the action of Mind, no cognition of any kind is possible

things, and it is by means of this Mind that the Conceiver does the conceiving * Such being the case, it appears to us that while admitting the existence of the Cogniser, you do not bear the idea of his being named 'Soul', and you give him the name 'Mind',—and though admitting that there is an instrument of Cognising, you cannot bear its being named 'Mind' So that it turns out to be a mere question of names,—there being no difference of opinion as to the thing the conceiving Soul itself † If, however you deny what has been said above, that would mean the dropping out of all Sense organs that is to say, if you deny that to the Conceiver of all things there belongs an instrument which brings about the conceiving of all things,—and hold that there is no such instrument—then a similar denial may be made in regard to the instruments of the cognition of Colour &c also, and this would mean the total denial of all Sense-organs §

* None of the readings given in the *Viz* text is satisfactory The best reading is supplied by the two *Puri* Mss—एवमन्तु सर्वविषयमतिमात्रं मन्तु वरणभूत सर्वविषयं विद्यते येनायमन्यत इति

The *Tātparya* says—The term *mati* conceiving stands here for remembrance and Inferential Cognition and even though the immediate cause of these consists in the impressions left by previous Perceptions yet being cognitions like the cognition of Colour they must be brought about by the instrumental ty of an organ and as such cognitions are found to appear also while the Visual and other organs are in operation it follows that the organ by which those cognitions are brought about is different from those organs

The *Parīśuddhi* adds—Even though the term *mati* is synonymous with *jñāna* and *buddhi*—all three standing for Cognition—yet what is meant by *mati* in the present context is direct cognition such as is preceded by a desire to cognize and such a cognition cannot but be brought about by the instrumental ty of some operative substance in contact with the body [and this substance is the Mind the organ of conception]

The *Bhāṣya* takes *mati* conceiving as standing for the cognition of Pleasure and Pain in which the Mind is the only organ concerned

† For अयं, the *Bhāṣya* and the two *Mss* read आत्मनि

§ The organ of vision is postulated for the explaining of colour-cognition the organ of smell for that of smell-cognition, and similarly the Mind is postulated for the explaining of the conception of Pleasure and Pain All these organs thus standing on the same footing if you deny one you must deny all

Sūtra 17

There is no reason in support of any definition

BHĀṢYA

[Between the organs of Vision etc. on the one hand and the organ of Conceiving on the other] the Opponent makes a distinction, while he admits that for the *Cogniser* there are instruments or organs for the *cognising* of Colour etc., he denies that there is any instrument for the *conceiving* of all things. And there is no reason, or justification, for any such differentiation, there is no reason on the strength of which we could accept any such differentiation (between the two sets of organs). As a matter of fact, Pleasure etc. are objects (of Cognition) different from such objects as Colour and the rest, so that it follows that for their cognition there should be an organ different from the organs for the cognition of the latter, the fact that Smell is not cognised by means of the Visual Organ leads us to conclude that there is a distinct organ in the shape of the Olfactory Organ. The fact that Taste is not cognised by means of the Visual and Olfactory Organs leads us to conclude that there is a distinct organ in the shape of the Gustatory Organ and so on with the other organs of Perception—exactly in the same manner, the fact that Pleasure etc. are not cognised by means of the Visual and other organs should lead us to conclude that there is a distinct organ (for the perceiving of Pleasure etc.), and this organ is the one whose existence is indicated by the non-simultaneity of Cognitions (see Su 1 1 16), that organ which serves as the instrument of the Cognition of Pleasure etc. is that one whose existence is proved by the fact that no two cognitions appear at the same point of time, that is to say, it is only by reason of the fact that at one time the said organ is in contact with only one Sense-organ, and not with another, that no two cognitions are found to appear at the same point of time. From all this it is clear that what has been asserted in the foregoing *Sūtra*—that 'the reasons adduced in support of the Soul are applicable to Mind'—is not true.

SECTION (5)

*The Soul is eternal**(Sūtras 18—26)*

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The question now arises]—The Soul, which has been proved to be something distinct from the Aggregate of the Body, &c.—is it eternal or non-eternal? “Why should there be a doubt on this point?” This doubt arises from the fact that both are seen; that is to say, things known to exist are found to be of both kinds,—some eternal and others non-eternal, so that it having been proved that the Soul exists, the doubt remains (as to its being eternal or non-eternal)

The answer to the above question is that those same arguments that have proved the Soul's existence also go to prove its previous existence (prior to its being endowed with the present body),—as is clear from the modifications undergone by this body (during all which the Soul's personality is recognised to be the same),*—and this Soul must exist also after the perishing of this body “Why so?”

Sūtra 18

Because the new-born infant experiences joy, fear and sorrow,—which could follow only from the continuity of remembrance of what has been repeatedly gone through before

* *Dehābhēdat* has been explained by the *Taitparyā* as follows—The continuity of the Soul's previous existence we deduce from the fact that during present life, while the body is seen to be changed, from childhood to youth and from youth to old age, the ensouling personality is recognised to be the same, so that the ‘Recognition,’ which has been found to supply the principal argument in support of the Soul's existence is also found to supply the argument for its existence prior to its being endowed with the present body

The *Bhāṣya* offers two explanations—(1) by one it makes *prāṇībhēdat* as one compound, meaning ‘because the present body (in youth) is different from the one that preceded it (in childhood), and (2) by the second it separates ‘*prāṇī*’ and takes it as qualifying ‘*asatthānam*’ The sense of the reasoning is the same in both cases, which is in keeping with the explanation supplied by the *Taitparyā*. The second *dehābhēdat* refers to the perishing of the body.

The *Parivandhī* suggests also another explanation of *dehābhēdat*:—The fact of recognition proves the existence of the Recognising Agent because the Body is something different from that Agent.

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, it is found that when an infant is born, he actually experiences joy, fear and sorrow, even though during his present life he has not perceived anything that could give rise to joy, fear or sorrow; and that he actually experiences these is inferred from certain clear indicatives;*—these experiences could proceed only from the continuity of remembrance, and not from any other source,†—this 'continuity of remembrance' again could not but be due to previous repeated experience, and the 'previous experience' could be possible only during a previous life,—so that from all this it follows that the Personality continues to exist even after the perishing of the body ‡

Sūtra 19

[Objection]—"What has been put forward is only a variation (of the transient Soul), resembling the variations of opening and closing undergone by the Lotus and other flowers "

BHĀṢYA

[Says the Opponent]—"In the case of such transient things as the Lotus and the like, we find that they undergo such modifications as opening and closing, in the same manner the transient Soul may be said to undergo variations in the form of experiencing joy and sorrow, [which therefore cannot prove the eternality of the Soul] "

This contention is not right, as there is no Reason That is to say, it cannot be shown that—"for such and such a Reason the experiencing of joy and sorrow by the Soul is to be regarded only as a variation of it, like the variations of opening and closing undergone by the Lotus and other flowers, "—in support of such

* These 'indicatives' are in the form of 'smiling' and 'crying'. The inference is in the form—"the state of infancy belongs to a Soul experiencing joy, fear and sorrow,—because it is accompanied by smiles and cries."—inferred from such indications as 'closing of the Eyes, throwing up of arms and legs, and crying'.—*Bhāṣyatandra*

† The infant's feeling of joy can only be accounted for as being due to his remembering the pleasant experiences of his previous life.

‡ The facts adduced prove that the Soul in the infant's body is one that has had a previous life and body, so that it is proved that after the perishing of that previous body, the Soul has continued to exist

a conclusion there is no Reason based upon any kind of instance analogous or otherwise * So that, in the absence of a Reason what has been urged can only be regarded as irrelevant and futile. Then again, the instance cited does not do away with what we have put forward as the cause of the Joy, &c., that is to say, what has been pointed out is that in the case of every ordinary (grown up) person it is found that in connection with objects already experienced in the past there are feelings of joy &c., brought about by the continuity of remembrance,—and certainly this fact is not set aside by the mere citing of the case of the closing of the Lotus, &c., and [when this cannot be set aside or denied in the case of ordinary grown up men] it cannot be denied in the case of the new born infant also † Further, the 'opening and closing' of the Lotus consist only in certain 'conjunctions and disjunctions' of its petals, which are brought about by a certain action, ‡ and Action must have a cause, as it is clearly inferable from the fact that it is an action (similarly the action of the child's smiling &c., must have a cause and this cause can only be the remembering of past experiences § Such

* Under Sūtras 1, 1 34-35 it has been shown that a Reason that can prove a conclusion must be based upon well known corroborative instances—these instances being either *per* similarity or *per* dissimilarity and as a matter of fact in support of the assertion put forward in this Sūtra by the Opponent there can be no Reason of either of these two kinds and the mere citing of the example (of Lotus) cannot prove anything [An example is effective only as pointing to and corroborating a Reason or Premiss]—*Bhāṣyacandra*

† This appears to be the simple meaning of this sentence. But according to the *Bhāṣyacandra* it means as follows—Just as it cannot be denied that the action of closing &c. of the Lotus is due to a certain cause so also it cannot be denied that the infant's action of smiling is due to a certain cause. This argument however is clearly put in the next sentence of the *Bhāṣya*.

‡ The reading of the *Vi2* text is unsatisfactory; the right reading is supplied by the two Pūrāṇas which is also supported by the *Bhāṣyacandra*—*क्रियावाताश्च परमयोगविभागः प्रवेद्यमस्मिन्*.

§ This passage is a little obscure all manuscripts except Pūrāṇa B read *क्रियाहेतुश्च क्रियानुमय* as in the *Vi2* text Pūrāṇa B reads *क्रियाहेतुश्च क्रियानुमय* which means—that there is such cause in the shape of Action (for the said conjunctions and disjunctions) is clearly inferred from the fact that these are actually brought about (and nothing can be brought about except by the force of an action).

From the above it is clear that Joy and Sorrow etc., cannot appear without a cause, and it is not possible to attribute these to any such other causes as Heat, Cold etc., (except the Continuity of Remembrance etc.) So that the view set up by the Opponent cannot be right

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

For the following reason also the Soul should be regarded as eternal —

Sutra 21

[The Soul must be regarded as eternal] because of the desire for milk from the mother's breast, which is evinced (on birth) after death,* and which can only be due to repeated feeding (in the past) —

In the infant just born we perceive a desire for the mother's milk,—the presence of such desire being indicated by the child's activities (in the shape of the moving of its hands and mouth towards the mother's breasts) This desire could not arise except from repeated experience in the past “For what reason (should this be accepted)?” In the case of all living persons we find that when they are afflicted by hunger, there appears in them desire for food, which desire arises from continuity of remembrance due to repeated experiences in the past, now in the case of the new-born infant, the appearance of such desire cannot but be explained as being due to repeated experiences in a previous body,—and from this it is inferred that the infant had a body previous to his present one, in which body it had gone through repeated experiences of feeding (which has given rise to its present desire for milk) From all this it follows that what happens is that the Soul, having (at death) departed from his previous body, has become endowed with a new body, and on

The *Bhāṣya* has added this in anticipation of the following argument—“You have proved that the variations of the Lotus and also those of the Soul proceed from a cause and are not fortuitous, we accept that but what do you say to this inference—the Soul must be something produced and destroyed, because it undergoes variations—like the Lotus?—This has been met by the *Bhāṣya* by pointing out that the citing of a mere example cannot prove anything at all as already pointed out above

* *Pratyā*—after death, i. e., in a person who, after having died is just born again.—*Bhāṣyacandro*

being afflicted with hunger, remembers his repeated feedings in the past, and (accordingly) desires the milk from the breast. Hence it cannot be true that there is a different soul to each of these bodies; it must be the same Soul that continues to exist, even after the perishing of its former body

Sūtra 22

[*Objection*]—"The action of the child is only like the moving of the iron to the magnet "

BIHĀṢYA

"In the case of the Iron it is found that it moves towards the Magnet, even without any repeated experience in the past, and similarly the desire (and consequent activity) of the child for the mother's milk may come about without any repeated experience in the past [So that the activity of the new born child does not necessarily prove past experience] "

INTRODUCTORY BIHĀṢYA

[In answer to the Opponent's argument in the preceding *Sūtra*, the *Siddhāntin* asks]—Is this 'moving up of the Iron' (that you have put forward) without any cause? Or is it due to a definite cause? *Without a cause*—

Sūtra 23

it cannot be, because there is no such action in any other thing (except Iron, and that too in the proximity of no other thing except Magnets)

BIHĀṢYA

If, in the case cited, the moving up of the Iron were without any cause (entirely fortuitous), then it would be possible for stone and other things also to move up to the Magnet and there would be no ground for any such restriction (as that Iron alone, and no other substance, moves up to the Magnet)

If, on the other hand, the moving of the Iron be held to be due to a definite cause, then we ask—Who ever perceives any such cause? [All that is perceived is that the Iron moves up to the Magnet]. As a matter of fact, the sole indicative of the cause of an action is the action itself, and (consequently) any limitations in the Action indicates similar limitations in the cause. It is this that accounts for the absence of moving in the

are similar links between his previous life and his life preceding that, and between that and a life preceding that, and so on and on (to infinity),—which shows that the connection of the Soul with bodies has been without beginning, and without beginning has also been his connection with longings, and from this (beginningless series of attachments and consequent bodies) it follows that the Soul is eternal

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The Opponent asks]—‘How do you know that the Longing of the new born child arises from the recalling of previously experienced things and not

Sūtra 25

“that it is produced in the same manner as substances and their qualities?”

BHĀṢYA

‘In the case of ordinary substances that are capable of being produced, their qualities are found to be produced by certain causes (in the shape of fire contact and the like)—in the same manner, in the case of the Soul which is capable of being produced, its quality in the form of Longing may be produced by certain causes (in the shape of Time and Place &c) *

The assertion put forward (in the present Sūtra) is only a repetition of what has already been said before †

Sūtra 26

[Answer]—It is not so, because Longing (and Aversion) are due to anticipation

BHĀṢYA

The Soul's longing cannot be said to be produced in the same manner as Substances and their Qualities—“Why? —

* Visvanatha explains this Sūtra somewhat differently: Just as an ordinary substance like the Jar is produced along with certain qualities so is the Soul also born as along with the quality of attachment

† The argument here urged is the same as that urged in Sūtra 22 there the argument was based upon the instance of the Iron and Magnet and in the present Sūtra it is based upon the example of such ordinary things as the Jar and the like

What the Bhāṣya means by this remark is that the answer to this argument is also the same as that offered to Sū 22 —Tātparṇya

Because Attachment and Aversion are due to anticipation. As a matter of fact, in the case of living beings experiencing pleasures and pains from objects, Longing is found to arise from anticipation or conviction [that such and such an object is the source of pleasure, or of pain],—this ‘anticipation’ arises from the recalling to Mind of previously experienced objects,—and from this fact it is inferred that in the case of the new born child also, the Longing must arise from the recalling to Mind of the previously experienced object*. On the other hand, for †persons who hold the view that the Soul is produced (or brought into existence anew, at each birth), the appearance of Longing must be explained as proceeding from a cause other than the said ‘anticipation’ [as no such anticipation from past experience is possible under this theory],—just as the coming into existence of substances and their qualities [which is due to causes other than ‘anticipation’] As a matter of fact, however, it is not yet proved that the Soul is actually produced ‡ nor do we find any other cause for ‘Longing,’ than the said ‘anticipation’ From all this it follows that it is not right to say that—‘the coming into existence of the Soul and its Longing is like the coming into existence of Substances and their Qualities’”

Some people explain the appearance of ‘Longing’ as being due to a cause entirely different from ‘anticipation’,—such cause, according to them, being in the form of the ‘Unseen Force’ consisting of ‘Merit—Demerit’ But even so (under this theory also) the Soul’s connection with a previous body cannot be denied For the said ‘Unseen Force’ (of ‘Merit—Demerit’) could have accrued to the Soul only during its connection with a previous body, not during its present life † As a matter of fact, however,‡

* The child recalls to mind the fact that the mother’s milk was a source of pleasure, and hence has longing for it

† In place of अस्मिन्पादाधिकरणान्तु, read आत्मोत्पादाधिकरणान्तु, which is the reading of the two Puri Mss., and also of the *Bhāṣyacandra*, which explains the word as आत्मोत्पाद. अधिकरण पक्षः नेषाम् तेषां वादिनान्तु मते.

‡ The *Viz.* text wrongly puts a stop after आत्मोत्पाद

† As in the present life the new-born person has done no acts that could bring to him *Dharma* or *Adharma*

‡ The author cites here a popular saying—*Bhāṣyacandra*.

source in the acts done by the Personality and becomes the receptacle* of pleasure and pain. In regard to this Body, we proceed to examine whether, like the Olfactory and other organs, it is composed of a single substance, or of several substances. 'Why should there be any doubt on this point?' The doubt arises from difference of opinion † People have held the Earth and other material substances to be the components of the Body, in varying numbers ‡ and the question naturally arises—What is the real truth? [The answer is supplied by the next *Sūtra*]

Sūtra 27

The Body must be regarded as composed of the Earth, because we find in it the distinctive quality (of Earth) ‡

of everything that has been mentioned and since the distinction of the Soul from the Body has been already explained in the previous section it now behoves us to examine in detail the exact nature of the Body. The real motive for this procedure has been explained by the *Tatparya* which points out that when one knows the exact nature of the Body and its appurtenances he loses all regard for it and hence acquires the necessary degree of dispassion which is necessary for Release.

* The Body is the receptacle of pleasure and pain only in the sense that they serve the purpose of qualifying and differentiating it—it is the Soul that is the actual receptacle of pleasure and pain as a receptacle of a thing in the proper sense of the term must be such as forms its substratum that in which the thing subsists by inherence (and not merely the container)—*Bhāṣya*—*candra*

† Both Puri manuscripts have a *ca* here and the *Bhāṣya*—*candra* remarks that this *ca* also, is meant to include the presence of diverse properties which is one of the principal sources of doubt (*vidē—Sū* 1 1 23)

‡ Some philosophers regard the Body as composed of a single material substance others of two others again of three others of four and others of five substances.—*Bhāṣya*—*candra*

‡ The *Parasūddhi* reads *tadīyatatvopapalabdheḥ*, which not being found in any manuscript we take as the paraphrase of the phrase '*gunantarepalabdheḥ*'. This peculiar quality of the earth is Odour—says the *Bhāṣya*—*candra* which is in keeping with the *Parasūddhi* it is only Odour that forms the peculiar quality of Earth. But *Viśvanātha* would include all such qualities as dark colour, solidity and so forth.

The *Parasūddhi* raises the question—In reality the Body is the receptacle of the activities of the Soul and it is on the basis of this character that its examination should proceed—what bearing has the composition of the Body got on its examination? What does it matter whether the Body is composed

BHĀṢYA

The human body must be regarded as composed of Earth, —Why?—*because we find in it the distinctive quality of Earth* The Earth is endowed with Odour, and so is also the Body —and inasmuch as Water and the other material substances are odourless, if the Body were composed of them it would be without odour But as a matter of fact, the Body could not form the receptacle of the Soul's activities, if it were built up of the Earth only, without being mixed with Water etc hence the Body should be regarded as being built up by the mixture of all the five material substances, the Sutra does not deny the mutual contact or mixture (in the Body) of the five substances *

Bodies composed of Water, Fire and Air are found in other regions,† and in these also the presence (by contact) of the several material substances is in accordance with the character of the experiences to be undergone by the personality ensouled in a particular body In the case of all such ordinary things as the Dish and the like, it is found without the least doubt, that they

of Earth or of Water? The answer given is that when it becomes ascertained that the Body is composed entirely of material substances it becomes comparatively easy to prove that intelligence cannot belong to it from which it would follow that—(a) it is the receptacle of the activities of which the contact of the existing Soul is the non-constituent cause —(b) that it is the substratum of the Sense-organs the developments whereof are due to the developments of the Body under the influence of food and drink — and (c) that it forms the receptacle of the experiences of the Soul related to the Body

* The Sādhanta says that the Body is composed of constituted by the Earth only the Earth alone forms its component cause though the presence by contact of the other four substances also is necessary in its formation but this does not make these four the constituent cause of the Body The Jar has for its constituent cause only the Clay and yet the presence of water is necessary The *Bhāṣyacandra* takes the term *dhātavaḥ* yoga as a *karmadhāraya* compound meaning well recognised presence the meaning being— the mere presence by contact of the other four which (contact) is duly recognised (*bhūta*) cannot be denied—the *Bhāṣyacandra* explaining *aniddha* as *aniddham lakṣaṇa*

† The aqueous body is found in the regions of Varuṇa the fiery body in the regions of the Sun and the aerial body in the regions of *Īśā* *Ākāśa* does not form the component of any body hence there is no *Ākāśa* or ethereal body—according to the Nyāya

are not built up without the contact of Water and other substances *

Sūtra 28

"The Body is made up of Earth, Water and Fire. Because we find in it the distinctive qualities of these, [i.e., Odour, Viscidity and Heat] " A

Sūtra 29

"It is made up of four substances (Earth, Water, Fire and Air), because we find in it in-breathing and out-breathing (in addition to the aforesaid qualities of Earth, etc) " B

Sūtra 30

"It is made up of five substances, Earth, Water, Fire, Air and Ākāś'a, because we find in it odour (of Earth), humidity (of Water), heat (of Fire), breathing (or circulation of the juices) (of Air) and cavities (of Ākāś'a)."† C

BHĀṢYA

The reasons put forward in these Sūtras being inconclusive, the author of the Sūtra has taken no notice of them [i.e., he has not taken the trouble to refute them]

Question — "In what way are they inconclusive?"

Answer — As a matter of fact, the presence of the qualities of material substances in any object may be due, either to the fact of those substances forming the constituents of that object, or to the fact that the mere presence by contact of these substances in any object is possible—(a) when those substances form the

* The *Bhāṣyacandra*, along with nearly all manuscripts, reads *nīṣamīṣaḥ* but *nīṣamīṣa*, appears to be the right reading. The only way of construing the form '*nīṣamīṣa*' is to take it, as the *Bhāṣyacandra* does, along with '*bhūtasamyogaḥ*' of the preceding sentence, otherwise (if we do not read *nīṣamīṣa*, and take it as qualifying '*nīṣamīṣa*'), the only form that could be admitted would be *nīṣamīṣam*.

† All these three are Sūtras. They are found in the *Nyāyavārtikā*, *Buddha*, and also in the *Purī Sūtra* manuscript. *Viśvanātha* and the *Bhāṣyacandra* both explain them as propounding the different opinions in regard to the composition of the human body. The editor of the *Viz.* text has been misled by the fact that these opinions have not been refuted by the Sūtra. But this omission has been satisfactorily explained by the *Bhāṣya*, which says that the Author of the Sūtra has taken no notice of these views, because the reasons put forward by them are of doubtful validity.

constituents of that object, and also (b) when they do not form the constituents, and are only present in it by contact, which presence is not denied (by any party),—for example in the case of the Dish we find that Water, Air, Fire and Ākāśa are all present by contact [even though the dish is composed of Earth only, and not of these four] [Thus it being found that the mere fact of the qualities of a certain material substance being found in the Body does not necessarily prove that the Body is actually composed of that substance,—the reasons put forward in the three Sūtras must be regarded as *inconclusive*]

If the human body were composed of several substances then, by reason of the peculiar character of its (multiple) constitution, it would be without odour, without taste, without colour and without touch * As a matter of fact, however, the Body is not so (Without Odour etc) Hence the conclusion is that *it should be regarded as composed of Earth, because we find in it the distinctive quality of Earth*

Sūtra 31

Also because of the authority of the Revealed Scripture
BHĀṢYA

In the *mantra*†—‘May thy Eye go to the Sun etc’ (*Rgveda* 10-16-3), we find the words—‘May thy Body go to the Earth’, and what is referred to here is the absorption of the product (the Body) into its constituent element. Again, we find another *mantra* (recited in the course of the rites of consecration performed in connection with child conception) beginning with the words—‘I create thy Eye out of the Sun’—and going on to say—‘I create thy Body out of the Earth’ (*S’atapatha Brāhmaṇa* 11-8-4 6), and what is referred to is only the production of the product (Body) out of its constituent element. In the case of the Dish and such other things, we find that one product is produced out of one kind of constituents, and from this we infer that it is not possible for any single product to be produced out of several heterogeneous constituents

* This has been explained in detail by the *Purīka*

† This *mantra* is recited over the dead body, in course of its consecration by fire

SECTION (7)
Sūtras 32-50

The Sense-organs and their Material Character
INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

In accordance with the order in which the 'Objects of Cognition' have been mentioned, it is now the turn of the *Sense organs* to be examined, and in regard to the Sense organs we are going to consider whether they are the modifications of Primordial Matter (as held by the Sāṅkhyas), or they are made up of elemental substances (Earth &c)*

"Whence does this doubt arise?"

[We have the answer in the following Sūtra]—

Sūtra 32

This doubt arises from the fact that there is perception (with the Eye) when the Pupil is there, and there is perception also when there is no contact with the Pupil

On one hand, it is found that there is perception of colour only when the Pupil, which is a physical organ made up of elemental substances, remains intact, and there is no perception when the Pupil is destroyed [which would indicate that the Visual organ consists of the Pupil only, which is made up of elemental substances], while on the other hand, it is also found that when an object is before the observer there is perception of it without its coming into direct contact with the Pupil, and it is not necessary for it to come into any such contact with the Pupil, and certainly Sense-organs cannot operate effectively without getting at, coming into direct contact with, the object perceived, and in

* It is interesting to note that while the *Bhāṣya* confines the discussion between the Sāṅkhya and the Naiyāyika, the *Tatparya* brings in here the controversy between the Naiyāyika and the *Bauddha* who holds that the organ is nothing apart from the outer physical body, i.e. the Visual-organ consists only of the Pupil and not of a Luminous Substance underlying the Pupil, as the Naiyāyika holds. The *Tatparya* also adds that according to the Sāṅkhya also the Sense-organ is not exactly a 'modification of Primordial Matter' itself, but it is the direct product of '*Ahaṅkāra*', Egoism, which is the product of *Buddhi*, which is the direct product of Primordial Matter. Even so inasmuch as Primordial Matter is the root-cause of all manifested things, it is quite right to say that according to the Sāṅkhya, the Sense organs are 'modifications of Primordial Matter'.

reality this latter fact (of an object being seen without coming into contact with the Pupil) can be explained *only on the basis* of the theory that the Organ is not made up of elemental substances and is all pervading in its character [and it does not consist of the Pupil] * So that both characters being found to belong to the Organ, the aforesaid doubt arises

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[In refutation of the above mentioned Bauddha-theory that the Visual Organ consists in the Pupil only, the *Sāṅkhya*] asserts as follows —

“ The Sense organs are not made up of Elemental Substances, —Why ?—

Sūtra 33

“ Because there is perception of large and small things

BHĀṢYA

“ The term ‘ large ’ includes also the *larger* and the *largest* ; and what is meant is that as a matter of fact, all things of various degrees of magnitude are perceived, e g, the (*large*) Banyan tree, as also the (*larger*) mountain, and so forth, — similarly the term ‘ small ’ includes also the *smaller* and the *smallest* and the meaning is that as a matter of fact things of various degrees of smallness are perceived, such as the Banyan seed and so forth. This fact of both kinds of things being perceived sets aside the possibility of the Sense organs being made up of Elemental Substances, as a matter of fact, that which is made up of Elemental Substances can pervade over (and operate upon) only such things as are of the same magnitude as itself, while

* The organ can be all pervading in character only if it be the product of *Ahaṅkāra* which being all pervading in its character, its products are also such and hence unimpeded by anything, can come into contact with *any* thing and everything, so that even though the object is not in physical contact with the physical Eye pupil it would not matter, as the Visual organ, being all pervading in its character, would be in contact with it all the same, and hence render it perceptible. If, on the other hand, the Visual organ were made up of Elemental Substances, it could not get at things behind any physical obstruction whatsoever, even in the shape of transparent things — *Tatparya*

that which is not so made up is all-pervading, and as such can operate upon all things (of all magnitudes) ”*

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The *Bhāṣya* answers the *Sāṅkhya* argument of Su. 33 as follows]—From the mere fact of there being apprehension of large and small things it cannot be inferred that the Sense-organs are not made up of elemental substances, or that they are all-pervading

Sūtra 34

The said apprehension (of large and small things) is due to the peculiarity of the contact between the light-rays (emanating from the Visual Organ) and the object (perceived)

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, the ‘apprehension of large and small things’ is brought about by the peculiarity of contact between the light-rays emanating from the Visual Organ and the object perceived, † just as there is by contact between the light-rays from the lamp and the object

That there is such contact between the light-rays (from the Visual Organ) and the Object perceived is proved by the phenomenon of obstruction, that is, when the rays of light emanating from the Eye are obstructed by such things as the wall and the like intervening between the Eye and the Object,

* The *Sāṅkhya* argument is thus stated by Viśvanatha —The Physical Eye-ball cannot be the organ of vision, for if it were then it would mean that the organ is operative without getting at the Object, which is open to objection. Then, it might be held that if the Eye ball is not the organ, it is something else made up of Elemental Substances which is the organ, —but this also would not be right, as the organ of vision apprehends things of large as well as small magnitudes, which would not be possible, if it were made up of Elemental Substances.

† The light rays emanating from the Visual Organ which are devoid of any manifested colour, form the constituent parts of the organ, which, according to the *Naiyāyika*, is made up of the Elemental substance of Light, the organ, consisting of the light-rays, issuing forth, comes into direct contact with the object, and whether it is a large or a small object perceived depends upon the exact nature and extent and force of the light-rays emanating from the organ. The example cited is that of the Lamp, because the light from the lamp also, like that from the Visual Organ is devoid of manifested colour.—*Bhāṣyacandra*

they do not illumine (and render perceptible) that object, this being exactly what happens in the case of light emanating from a Lamp [And this goes to prove that for the perception of objects, the direct contact of light from the Eye with the object is essential, for if this were not so, and if the organ were an all pervading one, the perception would not be obstructed by an intervening object]

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The Siddhāntin having put forward the view that the fact of the Visual Organ consisting of light-rays can be inferred from the phenomenon of obstruction,—the Opponent urges the following objection —

Sūtra 35

"Inasmuch as no such thing (as Visual light rays) is ever perceived, what has been put forward cannot prove any thing"

BHĀṢYA

"Inasmuch as by its very nature Light is endowed with colour and touch, the Light of the Visual Organ, if it existed, should be perceived,—just in the same manner as the Light of the Lamp is perceived,—according to the principle that 'the perception of a thing is due to its being possessed of large magnitude, being composed of several component particles, and being endowed with colour' * [And since the Light from the Eye is never perceived, it follows that no such Light exists]

Sūtra 36

[Answer to the objection]—Mere non Perception of that which can be deduced by inference is no proof of its non existence

* This principle is enunciated in the Vaiśeṣika-Sūtras, though the form of the Sūtra (4 1 6) is somewhat different from what is quoted here. The Sūtra is worded as महत्यनेकद्रव्यवत्त्वात् रूपवत्त्वाच्च उपलब्धिः

The Tatparjā explains the sense of the Opponent's object on this — 'When a thing which is capable of perception is not perceived, the only right conclusion is that it does not exist, and it would not be right to assert its existence on the ground of merely inferential reasons. If it were permitted, then it might be permissible to assert the existence of even such things as the horns of a man

BHĀṢYA

The existence of the light-rays (of the Visual Organ) being deduced by Inference from the phenomenon of 'obstruction', which shuts off (makes impossible) the contact (of the object with the Visual organ.)—mere non-apprehension of them by Perception does not prove non-existence, just as in the case of the upper surface of the lunar disc and the lower strata of the Earth (both of which are deduced by Inference and not apprehended by Perception, and yet not regarded as non-existent)

Sūtra 37

There being no uniformity regarding the character (of perceptibility or imperceptibility) as belonging to Substances and Qualities, there can be no certainty in regard to any particular thing being actually perceived *

BHĀṢYA

The said character (of Perceptibility or Imperceptibility) is diverse, inasmuch as it belongs (sometimes) to the Substance and (sometimes) to the Quality, for instance, while the Substance, in the shape of the molecule of Water (hanging in the atmosphere) with its constituent particles actually in contact (with our organs of perception), is not perceived (though the Visual organ),—its quality of coolness is perceived, and it is from the continuous presence (in the atmosphere) of such aqueous molecules that the two (Winter) seasons of *Hēmanā* and *S'is'ira* derive their character,—similarly while the Substance in the shape of the molecule of light (hanging in the atmosphere), with its colour unmanifested, fails to be seen, along with its colour,—its warmth is actually perceived, and it is from the presence of this substance that the two seasons of Spring and Summer derive their character [All this goes to prove that the mere non-perception of a thing is not a proof of its non-existence]

* The Viz -edition reads उपलब्धिनियम so also the *Nyayasuchibandha*. But we find the reading उपलब्धनियम in the *Bhāṣya* in the Pūrī Sūtra Ms., in Sūtra Ms. D., as also in the Pūrī Bhāṣya Mss. A and B. The translation adopts this latter reading.

Sūtra 38

Where it does come about,—

Perception of Colour (and coloured Substance) is the result of the subsistence of several component substances and of the presence of a particular character of Colour *

BHĀṢYA

That is to say, it is so whenever Colour and the Substance in which it subsists are apprehended by Perception. The particular character of Colour—by reason of whose presence colour (and coloured Substances) are perceived and on account of whose absence, a Substance (as endowed with colour) is not perceived—consists in what has been called its 'manifested character' †. It is for this reason (of perceptibility depending upon the *manifestation of colour*) that the Light ray from the Eye having its colour *unmanifested*, is not perceived with the Eye [and certainly this non-perception does not prove that the ray is non-existent]. In connection with Light, we find that it possesses a diversity of character *viz.* (a) sometimes it has both Colour and Touch manifested as in the Sun's rays (which are perceived by the Visual and Tactile organs) (b) in some cases it has its Colour manifested but Touch unmanifested, as in the rays of light from the Lamp (which are perceived with the Visual organ) (c) in some cases it has its touch manifested and colour unmanifested as light in contact with (heated) Water and such other things (which are perceived by the Tactile Organ only) and (d) in some cases it has both Colour and Touch unmanifested and is as such *not perceptible*, (either by the Visual or by the Tactile Organ)—e.g. the light rays emanating from the Eye.

Sūtra 39

The formation of the Sense organs being due to Merit and Demerit is subservient to the purposes of man

* This Sūtra is not found in Viśvanātha's *Pratya* nor in the *Nyāya-sūtraśāvarana* nor in Sūtra Mś D nor in Purī Sūtra Mś. But the *Tārīkā* the *Nyāyavācīnibandha* and the *Bhāṣyacandra* treat it as Sūtra.

† That is Colour and Coloured object are perceived only when the colour is manifested.

‡ The *Bhāṣyacandra* explains पुद्गलार्थतया, as brought about by man's purpose. But from the *Bhāṣya* it is clear that it means subservient to man's purpose.

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact the Sense organs are formed in accordance with the purposes of the sentient being served by them — such 'purpose' consisting of the *perception of things* and the *experiencing of pleasure and pain*, so that the generation of the light ray in the Eye is for the purpose of getting at (and operating upon) the object perceived,* and the fact that the Colour and Touch (of this Light in the Visual Organ) are not manifested is deduced from (and assumed on the basis of) certain well known usages [such, e.g., as the dictum that 'the Sense organs are themselves beyond the senses, and so forth']† Similarly it is from usage (and experience) that we deduce the fact that, in regard to certain objects there is hindrance (to the operation of the Visual organ) which indicates the presence of obstruction. In fact, as the Sense organs, so also the manifold and diverse formation of all things, is 'due to Merit and Demerit (of Men being born into the World) and is subservient to the purposes of Man'.

The term '*Karma*' (in the Sutra) stands for Merit and Demerit' which serves to bring about the experiences of the sentient Person

The said 'Obstruction can belong only to a material substance, because there is unfailing concomitance § That is to

* From the general principles enumerated in the Sutra it follows that because objects are perceived with the Eye and the Eye socket or Pupil is unable to get at the object — and sense organs cannot apprehend things without getting at them — we conclude that the formation of the Eye must be such that it is able to get at the object and hence we come to the conclusion that the Eye is composed of Light and it is the ray of light that issuing from the Eye falls upon the object that is seen with it

† The *Bhāṣyacandra* explains *Vyutahāra* as *Vyutaharatuseṣah* *Vīci* *trajananaśabdaprayogarūpadih* *Atindriyamindriyamitpadih*. There are certain well known notions in connection with the Sense-organs, one of these being that the Sense organs themselves cannot be perceived by the Senses and in the case of the Eye this would be true only if the Eye consisted of such Light as has its colour and touch unmanifested, if it consisted of the Pupil only the Eye could not be *imperceptible*

§ This sentence has been printed in the Viz edition as a Sūtra. But neither Sū Ma D nor the *Nyāyavivartanābandha* nor the Purī Sū Ma nor Vivartanātha nor the *Nyāyavivartanāśāstra*, nor the *Bhāṣyacandra* read any such Sūtra. We do not, therefore treat it as a Sūtra

BHĀṢYA

It is only when the Visual Organ is aided by some external light that it becomes capable of apprehending things, and in the absence of such light, there is no apprehension with the Visual Organ [So that it is on account of the absence of an external light falling upon it that the Visual Light is not perceived] As a matter of fact, even when the aid of (external) light is present, and there is perception also of Cool Touch, the object in which that touch subsists, (i. e. the particles of Water hanging in the atmosphere) fails to be perceived with the Eye, for the simple reason that its Colour is not manifested, this shows that there is non perception of an object endowed with Colour by reason of its Colour being not manifested * For these reasons we conclude that what the *Pūroapakṣin* has said in Su 35—that 'inasmuch as no such things (as the Visual Light ray) is ever perceived what has been put forward cannot prove any thing'—is not right

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Question—"But why is suppression not put forward as the reason for the non perception of the Visual Light?" [The answer is given in the following Sūtra]

Sūtra 43

Because there can be suppression (of Colour) only when it is manifest also

* In the case of the Water particle hanging in the atmosphere what happens is that its Colour not being manifested it is not perceived with the Eye and that this is so we infer from the fact that in the perception of Water we require the aid of external light similarly, the Visual Light also requiring for its perception the aid of external light it follows that the non perception of this also must be due to the non manifestation of its Colour It is a generally recognised principle that a thing which requires for its perception the aid of external light fails to be perceived only when its Colour is not manifested, so that the non perception of such a thing must be attributed to the non manifestation of its colour and not to its suppression by stronger light as it found to be the case with the light of stars which not requiring the aid of any external light in its perception has its non perception at midday due to suppression by the light of the Sun — *Vartika and Tatparya*

† This question emanates from those Logicians who hold that Visual Light has its Colour manifested like any ordinary Light and it is not perceived because it is suppressed by the stronger light of the atmosphere

BHĀṢYA

—and also when it is not dependent for its perception upon external light; this is the implication of the particle 'cha', 'also'. As a matter of fact, there is suppression of only such Light as is manifested—i.e. duly evolved—and does not depend upon the aid of external light [as we find in the case of Stars], when, on the other hand, such conditions are absent, (e.g., in the case of the Light in such things as the Visual Organ), there can be no suppression, which leads us to conclude that when a certain Light, which is not perceived (with the Eye) by reason of its Colour being not manifested, becomes perceived when some external light falls upon it,—such Light cannot be said to be 'suppressed'.

From the above it follows that the Visual Light does exist (and is endowed with a particular form and character)

Sūtra 44

Also because we actually perceive the Light in the eyes of night-walkers.

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact we actually see rays of light in the eyes of 'night-walkers'—i.e. the cat and other animals (of the feline species), and from this we infer the existence of light in the eyes of other living beings

"But just as the genus (of the Cat) is different (from that of Man), so would their sense organs also be of different characters [so that the mere fact of the Cat's Eye possessing rays of light cannot justify the inference of the existence of Light in the Eyes of Man]"

There is no justification for the assumption that there is such difference of character (between the Eye of the Cat and the Eye of the Man), specially in view of the fact that both are equally found to have their approach (upon visible objects) hindered by obstructions such as the wall and other things. [Which fact is what forms the main ground for the assumption that the Visual Organ consists of Light]*

* The mere fact that while we see light-rays emanating from the Cat's Eye, and not those emanating from the Man's Eye, cannot justify the assumption that the two are not of the same kind of 'sense-organ', in the case of the Sun and the Moon, though the former is felt to be hot and the latter cool, both are regarded as 'luminous', hence mere difference in some detail of character does not prove diversity of 'genus'.—*Bhāṣyatandra*

and the meaning assigned to the Sūtra is in accordance with this construction

(a) The rays of the Sun are not hindered by the Jar and such things,—‘as there is no obstruction’ in this case, and the Water in the Jar becomes heated, such imbibing of the quality of warmth of one thing (Light) by another (i.e., Water) is possible only when there is actual contact (between the two things), and the original coolness (of the Water) becomes suppressed by the warmth thus imbibed

(b) When the object to be illumined is hidden behind rock crystal, there is no obstruction to the lamp rays falling upon it, and ‘because there is no obstruction’, the object is got at by the light, and becomes perceived

(c) When the thing is placed in a frying pan over the fire it becomes burnt by the light of the fire, and here also ‘because there is no obstruction’ to the light-rays, the thing is got at by them, and because it is thus got at, it becomes burnt, and the heat (of the Light) is operative only by contact

The term ‘*avighātāt*’, ‘because there is no obstruction’, may also be taken by itself (as propounding a fourth argument), “What would be the meaning of ‘*avighāta*’, ‘non-obstruction’ (in this case)?” It would mean that there is no hindrance on any side to the progress of the substance (Light) by any such intervening substance as has its component particles not ruptured and transformed (by the Light passing through them), * i.e., there is no hindrance to its operation, i.e., there is no obstacle to its contact (with the object) For instance, we find that water placed in an earthen jar imbibes the coolness of the outer atmosphere [in which case the hot light rays go out of the Water through the intervening jar, without dismembering and transform

* The term ‘*vyuhyamāna*’ is used here in a peculiar sense, it has been explained by the *Tatparya* as meaning ‘dismemberment’, the sense being that when the thing in the frying pan is burnt by the heat of the fire in the oven, the heat passing through the pan does not tend to the dismemberment of the pan’s component particles, i.e., it does not so happen that the pan is broken up and another pan appears in its place And this permeating of the rays of light and heat—without dismembering and transforming the intervening substance,—is what is meant by ‘non-obstruction’.

ing the latter].* And there can be no perception of the *touch* (warmth or coolness) of a thing unless it is got at by the Sense-organ; and we also see (in the case of the Water in the Jar) that there is percolation, as also flowing out,† [which also shows that substances can pass through an intervening substance without dismembering or transforming it]

Thus then, it becomes established that in the case of things hidden behind glass or vapour or rock-crystal, perception duly comes about, 'because there is no obstruction' to the rays of Visual Light by the said glass, etc., and they get at the object by passing through the intervening glass, etc

Sūtra 49

[Objection]—"The view put forward is not right: because there is possibility of either of the two characters belonging to either of the two substances "

BHĀṢYA

"(a) Whether there is *non obstruction* (of the Visual Light) by the Wall and such other things, just as there is by glass and vapour, etc., or (b) there is *obstruction* by glass and vapour, etc., just as there is by the wall,—inasmuch as both these alternative views are equally possible, it behoves you to show cause which, and why, is the right view "‡

Sūtra 50

[Answer]—Just as there is perception of Colour in the Mirror and in Water,—by reason of these two being, by their nature, bright and white,—similarly there is perception of Colour (also in the case of such intervening substances as Glass etc., which are, by their nature, transparent)

* This parenthetical explanation is according to the *Vārtika* and *Tātparyya*.

† The *Vārtika* reads '*parispanda*' for '*praspanda*', and explains it as *lateral motion*. The *Bhāṣyātandra* reads '*praspanda*', and explains it as *percolating through the pores*, '*parisrāta*' standing for *actual flowing out*.

‡ The *Purī Maṣ* read *Niyama* for *Niyame*, the *Bhāṣyātandra* also notices this reading and explains it to mean that "it is absolutely necessary to state your reasons".

BHĀṢYA

The Mirror and Water are possessed of '*prasāda*'—i.e., a particular colour (bright-white), which belongs to them by their very nature, as is shown by the fact of their always possessing it, and of this 'bright white colour' also, it is the very nature that it reflects (and renders visible) the Colour (of things placed before it), and in the case of the Mirror, we find that when a man puts his face before it, the light rays emanating from his eyes strike the Mirror and are turned back (reflected) and thereby they come into contact with the man's own face, whose colour and form thus become perceived, this perception being called 'the perception of the reflected image' and it is brought about by the peculiar colour of the Mirror's surface that it is so is proved by the fact that any such reflection fails to appear whenever there is a deterioration in the brightness of the Mirror's surface [Though such is the case with the Mirror yet] There is no such 'perception of the reflected image' in the case of the Wall and such other things [and the only explanation possible is that these latter things are not endowed with that particular property which would enable them to reflect the light rays from the Eye] In the same manner, even though there is *non-obstruction* of the Visual Light by such things as the Glass and Vapour, etc. yet there is *obstruction* by such things as the Wall and the like and this is due to the very nature of the things concerned [which must be accepted as they are]

Sutra 51

It is not right to question or deny things that are (rightly) perceived and inferred *

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, every Instrument of Right Cognition apprehends things as they really exist, so that when certain things are cognised by means of Perception or Inference it is not right for you in course of your inquiry, to question the reality of these things—nor is it right for you to deny their reality. It would, for instance, not be right to argue that 'just

* Puri Su Ms reads *paryamāyoga* for *pratiśedha* and Puri Bha Ms B reads '*pratyoga*' it is clear from the *Bhāṣya* that *pratiśedha* is the right reading

as Colour is visible by the Eye, so should Odour also be visible', or that 'like Odour, Colour also should not be visible by the Eye', or that 'like the cognition of Fire, the cognition of Water also should arise from that of Smoke', or that 'like the cognition of Water, that of Fire also should not arise from that of Smoke' And what is the reason for this? Simply this, that things are cognised by means of the Instruments of Right Cognition just as they really exist, exactly as endowed with their real nature, and as possessed of their own real properties, so that Instruments of Right Cognition always apprehend things as they really exist. You have put forward the following *question* and *denial*—(a) 'there should be non-obstruction (of Visual Light) by the Wall, etc., just as there is by Glass and such things' and (b) 'there should not be non-obstruction by Glass, etc., just as there is none by the Wall, etc.' But it is not right to do so because the things that we have described (in connection with the obstruction or non-obstruction of Visual Light by certain objects) are such as are actually cognised by means of Perception and Inference, whether there is *obstruction* or *non-obstruction* (of a certain thing by another thing) can be determined only by our perception or non-perception, (i.e. it depends upon our perceiving or not perceiving such obstruction) so that in the case (in question) from the fact that there is no perception of things behind the Wall and such things, it is *inferred* that there is obstruction by these things, and from the fact that there is perception of things behind glass and vapour, etc. it is inferred that there is non-obstruction by these latter.

SECTION (8)

Sūtra 52-61

(The Sense organs one or many?)

DHĀṢYA

[Now the question arises]—Is there only one Sense organ? or several Sense-organs? * "Why should this doubt arise?" [The Sūtra answers]—

* The sequence of this section is thus explained by the *Parīṣuddhi*—
 "In the foregoing section, it having been established that the Sense-organs are made up of material substances, and that they are operative by contact—it has next to be proved that there are several Sense-organs, and the

Sūtra 52

The doubt arises—because by reason of Subsistence in several places, there should be multiplicity, and yet a single composite actually subsists in several places *

determination of this point is necessary as preliminary to what has gone before. For, if the Sense-organs are one only—and not many—then they cannot be made up of material substances, and if they are not material in their character, they cannot be operative by contact. Because if there is only one Sense organ, there would be no force in such reasonings as—'the Visual organ must consist of Light because from among Colour and other things it renders perceptible only Colour', and so forth, and under the circumstances it could not be proved that the Organ operates by contact as it is only when the organ is proved to be material in its character that it can be held to be operative by contact. The real purpose served by the present discussion is that when it has been proved that there are several Sense-organs, then alone can there be any force in such reasons for the existence of the Soul as—'one and the same object is apprehended by the organs of Vision and Touch' and like.

* The Sūtra presents a difficulty. The words as they stand mean—'We find several things occupying several places and also a single thing occupying several places'—But the *Vartika* and *Tatparya* are dissatisfied with this. The grounds for dissatisfaction are explained by the *Vartika*, and amplified by the *Tatparya*—If we take the words of the *Sūtra* as they stand, it would mean—'we have seen that when there is diversity of place there is multiplicity, as when several Jars occupy diverse places, and we also find a single thing occupying several places, as when a single composite resides in several of its components'. But such statement would be open to the following objections—in clause (a) 'diversity of place' स्थानान्यत्व denotes the quality of 'diversity' as subsisting in the *Place* and in clause (b) the term नानास्थानत्व, 'the character of occupying several places', denotes a quality subsisting in something else other than *Place*. But Doubt can never arise from two qualities subsisting in two distinct things. For these reasons, the reasoning of the Sūtra could be resolved into one or other (not both) of the following, and neither would be right. For if the reasoning is put in the form—(a) 'Doubt arises because we have seen multiplicity and unity when there is diversity of place—then inasmuch as this quality of diversity would belong to the place it would not belong to any one thing, and hence it would not be common to both (one and many) specially as what the Sūtra has pointed out (in clause b) is only the fact of the one thing having the quality of occupying several places, and it does not put forward the diversity as belonging to the Place—this latter has been put forward (in clause a) only in connection with multiplicity. If, on the other hand, the reasoning is put in the form—(b)—'Doubt arises because we have found Unity and Multiplicity when things occupy several places'—

As a matter of fact, we find that when different places are occupied, there are several substances, and yet the Composite

then the difficulty is that, as a matter of fact, there is no substance which occupies several places, each substance occupying only one place, so that in this also the character would not be a common one, specially as what the Sūtra declares in clause (b) is the fact that *the character of occupying several places* indicates unity of the thing. As for the contingency when several Jars occupy several places this has been spoken of, in clause (a) as indicating *diversity of place*, and not *the character of occupying several places*.

[For these reasons], the *Bhāṣya*, ignoring the literal meaning of the words of the Sūtra, which would be apparently irrelevant, has explained the Sūtra according to its sense—says the *Parisuddhi*. And this sense is as rendered in the translation. The whole point of the difference is that the 'occupying of several places' should be taken as belonging to the *Sense-organs* specifically, and not to things in general,—and that of *occupying of several places* indicating *multiplicity* as well as *singleness*.

The *Dharmasūtra* offers the following explanation —

स्थानानि अन्यानि यस्य तस्य तन्नाम तस्य भावः 'स्थानान्येकम्' अनेकस्थान स्थितत्वेन तेन नानात्वात् तद्वशापि तन्नानात्वात्. [This explanation of the compound avoids the difficulty raised in the *Vartika*—Because *multiplicity* of Sense organs is indicated by the fact that it is found in several places'—and अथयदितः एकस्य नानास्थानत्वात् नानावयवाधारकत्वात् एकत्वम्, and yet inasmuch as a single composite resides in several of its components, it would seem that the Sense-organ is one only.]

The difficulty raised appears to be more verbal than real. What the Sūtra means is simply this—'we find that when things occupy several places, they are many [e.g., when the Jar and the Cloth occupy different places]; and we also find a single thing occupying several places, e.g., the Composite is single and yet it resides in several components, so that when we find the Sense-organs occupying different places, there arises a Doubt as to whether they are several (like the Jar and the Cloth), or one (like the composite)'—as Visvanatha puts it. And all that the *Vartika* insists upon is the fact that as the Sūtra should be construed as simply putting forward the character of *occupying several places*—as belonging to the *Sense-organs*—as the property common to 'one' and 'several', and hence giving rise to doubt as to the Sense organs being *one* or *many*. And even when we take the Sūtra as referring to things in general, the implication is exactly this.

Vardhamāna, in the *Nyāyabandhoprakāśa*, puts the difficulty in a somewhat different manner —'As the words of the Sūtra stand, the first clause mentions *multiplicity* due to *diversity of place*, and it does not make any mention of *singleness* (the second factor of the Doubt); similarly, the second clause mentions *singleness* during *diversity of place*, and it does not make any mention of *multiplicity*; so that in either case, the Doubt remains unaccounted for.'

Sūtra 54

[*Siddhānta*].—It is not true [that there is only one Sense-organ]; because (several) things are not perceived simultaneously.

BHĀṢYA

[According to the view that there is only one sense-organ apprehending all things, what would happen would be that] the Soul would come into contact with the Mind, the Mind with the single Sense organ, and the single sense-organ with all objects (Colour, Odour, Touch, Taste and Sound), so that (in every act of Perception), the contact of the Soul, the Mind the Sense-organ and the several objects being present, there would be perception, at one and the same time, of all these objects. As a matter of fact, however, Colour and such other objects are never perceived at one and the same time. Hence it follows that it is not true that there is a single sense-organ operating on all objects of perception.

Further, by reason of the non-concomitance of the perceptions of things, it cannot be accepted that there is a single sense-organ apprehending all things, if there were concomitance of perceptions of several things, then no blindness etc., would be possible*.

Sūtra 55

The Cutaneous Organ cannot be the only sense-organ, as this would involve inner contradictions.]

* The difference between 'non-simultaneity of perceptions' urged before and the 'non-concomitance of perceptions', urged now is not quite clear. The distinction, according to the *Parīka* and the *Parīuddhī* is that 'non-simultaneity' is more general, referring principally to simultaneity of Perceptions, the sense being that several perceptions cannot appear at the same time; while 'non-concomitance' refers mainly to the objects perceived, the sense being that the several perceptions do not always appear together, i.e., it is not necessary that the perception of Odour must always be accompanied by the perception of Colour, if that were so then at the time that the blind man perceives Odour, he could have the perception of Colour also, and he would not be blind at all.

The *Parīuddhī* remarks that what the *Sūtra* really means to urge here is, not exactly the 'non-simultaneity of cognitions', but only the impossibility of several things being perceived at one and the same time.

† The *Bhāṣya* explains the term '*apratishedha*' as '*pratiśedha*', 'denying after affirming'—i.e., contradicting oneself.

This *Sūtra* is not found in Viśvanātha, the *Bhāṣya* appears to treat it as *Bhāṣya*, it is not found in *Sūtra* Ms. D nor in the *Purī Sūtra* Ms. It is found in the *Nyāyatattvabandha*, and the *Parīka* also treats it as *Sūtra*.

BHĀṢYA

The Cutaneous Organ cannot be regarded as the only Sense-organ; as such a view involves inner contradictions: That is, it would mean that by that Organ, Colour etc., are perceived without being in contact with it,—and if the organ is operative without contact (as it is *ex-hypothesi*, in the perception of Colour etc.), then it should be so in the perception of Touch also, or if Touch etc., are apprehended by the organ by contact only, then Colour etc., also should be apprehended by contact only.* It might be urged that—‘the Cutaneous Organ operates half and half’ But, in that case, since no obstruction would be possible, any and every object would be equally perceived. That is to say, if you mean that—“Touch etc., are apprehended by the Cutaneous Organ only when they are in contact with it, while Colours are apprehended by it without being in contact with it,”—then (our answer is that), under such a theory (where apprehension is possible *without contact*) there would be no obstruction (to the operation of the Organ), and there being no obstruction, there would be perception of all colours, the hidden as well as the unhidden, nor would there be any ground for the well known phenomenon that there is perception of Colour near at hand, and no perception of Colour at a distance, that is to say, if the Cutaneous Organ apprehends Colour without being in contact with it, then there would be no reason for the phenomenon that, while Colour is not perceived from a distance, it is perceived when near at hand.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The plurality (of sense organs) having been proved (indirectly) by the denial of singleness, the Sūtra proceeds to propound direct positive arguments in support of the same †

* The right reading माहन्ति अहम् is supplied by the Puri Mss. A. and B.

† This sentence has been construed in two ways, by the *Vartika* — (1) *Ekatvapratishedhat anantaram*,—‘after having negated singleness — *anantavosiddhau itthapanahetuḥ upadiyate*—‘the Sūtra propounds arguments in support of plurality’—or (2) ‘*Ekatvapratishedhat anantavosiddhau*’—‘the plurality of sense-organs having been proved (indirectly) by the denial of singleness, the Sūtra proceeds to propound direct arguments in support of the same’.

Sūtra 56

Because the objects of the Sense-organs are five fold
BHĀṢYA

The term '*artha*' stands for *prajojana*, 'object' or 'purpose', and as a matter of fact, this 'object' of the sense-organs is five-fold, that is, when Touch is apprehended by the Tactile Organ, that same organ does not apprehend Colour, hence we infer the existence of another, the Visual organ, which serves the 'purpose' of apprehending Colour, similarly when Colour and Touch are apprehended (by the Tactile and the Visual organs respectively), these two organs do not apprehend Odour, which leads us to infer a third, the Olfactory Organ, which serves the 'purpose' of apprehending Odour,—in the same manner, when the three (Touch, Colour and Odour) are apprehended (by the Tactile, the Visual and Olfactory organs respectively), these same organs do not apprehend Taste hence we infer the existence of the fourth, the Gestatory Organ, which serves the 'purpose' of apprehending Taste,—lastly, when the four (Touch, Colour, Odour and Taste) are apprehended (by the Tactile, the Visual, the Olfactory, and the Gestatory organs respectively) those same organs do not apprehend Sound, hence we infer the fifth Auditory Organ, which serves the 'purpose' of apprehending Sound. Thus, from the fact that the purpose of one sense-organ is not served by another, it follows that there are *five* Sense-organs

Sūtra 57

[*Objection*]—“What is asserted cannot be accepted because the 'objects' are many (and not 'five')”

BHĀṢYA

[*Says the Opponent*]—“That there are '*five*' sense-organs cannot be regarded as rightly proved by the fact that *the objects of the sense-organs are fivefold*. Why?—*Because the said objects are many*. The 'objects' of the Sense organs are several, e.g., there are three kinds of Touch—the cool, the hot and the neither-cool nor hot, there are endless colours—in the shape of white, green and the rest, there are three odours—agreeable disagreeable and indifferent, there are several tastes—the bitter and the rest, Sound is diverse appearing in the form of letters as also in that of mere indistinct sound. In view of these facts

the man who would hold the sense-organs to be *five* on the ground of the objects of the Sense-organs being five fold, should also have to admit that there are many (more than five) Sense-organs, because the objects of the sense-organs are many."

Sūtra 58

[Answer]—Inasmuch as (the several kinds of Odour are) nothing more than 'odour,' there can be no denial of Odour or the rest (as constituting the 'five Sense-organs')

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, Odour (Colour, Taste, Touch and Sound) have their exact extension precisely determined through their respective Universals—so that the perceptions of these can be rightly regarded as indicating the existence of distinct apprehending instruments, only when it is found that they (the perceptions) are such as are *not* brought about by the same (or similar) instruments*. Further, the argument that has been put forward (in Su 56) has for its subject the 'perceptible things' as *grouped under well defined heads*, and not *individual things, severally*, while your denial (in Su 57) of the number 'five' as applied to 'perceptible things' refers to individual things regarded severally. Consequently the denial cannot be regarded as right and proper†

"But how do you know that Odour and the rest have their extension precisely determined through their respective Universals?"

Well, as a matter of fact, the three kinds of Touch—the cool, the warm and the neither-warm-nor cool—are all grouped

* The reading न प्रयोजयन्ति is wrong, the right reading is प्रयोजयन्ति as found in the two Purāṇa Mss and in the *Bhāṣyacandra*, and also supported by the *Bhāṣya* below

† All Odours are apprehended by the same organ, hence they are grouped under one head and regarded as 'one', similarly with Colour, Taste, Touch and Sound. Hence these five groups justify the assumption of five 'Sense-organs'. The Opponent takes each Odour as a distinct unit, and for each such unit he would have one organ and hence he does not agree to restrict the number of organs to five only. But when all Odours are actually found to be apprehended by the same organ there is nothing to justify the assumption of several organs for the apprehending of Odour

(and unified) under the single *Universal* of 'Touch', so that when we perceive the cool Touch (by the Tactile Organ), the perception of the other two kinds of Touch—the warm and the neither-warm nor-cool—cannot indicate, or justify the assumption of, other instruments (distinct from the said Tactile Organ); for the simple reason that all the several kinds of Touch are as a matter of fact perceptible by the same instrument; that is the other two kinds of Touch also are actually perceived by means of the same organ as the cool Touch. Similarly, all kinds of Odour are included under the single group 'Odour', all kinds of Colour under 'Colour', all kinds of Taste under 'Taste' and all kinds of Sound under 'Sound'. As for the perceptions of Odour (Taste, Colour, Touch and Sound), on the other hand, each of these is found to be obtained by means of a different kind of instrument, and as such they indicate so many different organs. From all this it becomes established that 'because the objects of the Sense-organs are five-fold, there are five Sense-organs'.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[Says the Opponent]—"If things can be grouped under a *Universal*, then it follows that all the Sense-organs—

Sūtra 59

"should be regarded as 'one', their (several) objects being no more than 'object'.

BHĀṢYA

"That is to say, all objects being included under the single *Universal* of 'object' [the 'objects of the Sense-organs' are one, from which it follows that there is only one Sense-organ]"

Sūtra 60

[Answer]—Not so; because of the fivefoldness—(a) of the signs (or indicatives) in the shape of Perceptions, (b) of the location, (c) of the process (operation), (d) of the shape (magnitude) and (e) of the constituents

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, objects are never found to have their extension determined through the *Universal* of 'Object', and hence they cannot all be inferred as perceptible by any single organ, independently of other organs; in the case of Odour etc.

on the other hand, we find that they do have their extension determined by their respective Universals 'Odour' and the rest, and as such they are inferred as perceptible—each by a distinct Sense organ. Hence what is urged (in Su 59) is entirely irrelevant

This is what is described in detail in the Sutra —

(A) *Because of the fivefoldness of the signs in the shape of Perceptions*, what indicate the existence of Sense organs are our own perceptions, since the presence of Sense organs is proved only by the perception that we have of certain things —this has been already explained in the Bhaṣya on Su 56, which speaks of the 'fivefoldness of the objects of the Sense-organs' —thus then, inasmuch as the 'indicatives of Sense organs', in the shape of perceptions, are fivefold, the Sense-organs must be five

(B) The *location* also of the Sense-organs is *fivefold* (1) The Tactile Organ, which is indicated by the perception of Touch, has its *location* throughout the body, (2) the Visual Organ, which, as issuing out of the body, is indicated by the perception of Colour, has its *location* in the pupil of the Eye, (3) the Olfactory organ has its *location* in the Nose, (4) the Gestatory organ has its *location* in the Tongue, (5) the Auditory Organ has its *location* in the cavity of the Ear,*—all this being proved by the fact that the five organs have their existence indicated by the perceptions of Odour, Taste, Colour, Touch and Sound

(C) On account of the fivefoldness of the *processes* also there is diversity in the Sense-organs e.g., (in visual perception) the Visual Organ encased in the pupil issues outside and then gets at the objects possessed of Colour, the Organs of Touch (Taste and Odour) on the other hand are themselves got at by the objects, which latter reach the Organs by the movements of the

* The *Bhaṣya* remarks that, inasmuch as the Auditory organ consists of *Ākāśa* it is not right to locate it in the Ear-cavity. To avoid this difficulty, it offers other explanations of the compound *karnadhara-dhūṣṭhanam* (1) '*dhūṣṭham*, 'cavity' stands for a particular form of contact, and '*karna* stands for an object made up of earth particles and '*adhūṣṭhana*' stands for auxiliary, hence the whole compound means 'that which has for its auxiliary an object made up of earth particles'—or (2) 'that which is the *adhūṣṭhana*—substratum,—of the contact of the Ear —Both these interpretations would apply to the *Ākāśa*

body in which the Organs exist, while the contact of the Auditory Organ with the Sound (heard) is obtained by reason of this latter proceeding in a series

(D) 'Ākṛti, shape,' stands for the exact limit or extent of magnitude, and this is found to be fivefold. The Olfactory, the Gestatory and the Tactile Organs have their shape or magnitude restricted to their respective substrata (in the body, the shape of the Olfactory organ is the same as that of the Nose, and so forth),—and are inferred (as distinct from the perception of their objects),—while the Visual organ, though located in the pupil, moves out of the socket and pervades over the object,—while, lastly, the Auditory Organ is nothing other than Ākāśa itself, and like Ākāśa, is all pervading,—being inferred only from the perception of Sound, and yet this Organ manifests or renders audible only certain particular sounds,—being restricted in its scope by the substratum (body) in which it subsists by reason of the force of the peculiar faculties (of Merit and Demerit) belonging to the person concerned *

(E) By *Jals*, 'Constituent', is meant 'source', the 'sources' or 'constituents' of the Sense-organs are five, in the shape of the rudimentary substances, Earth (Air, Water, Light and Ākāśa). It follows therefore that, because the 'constituents' are five the Sense-organs also must be five

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

(The Sāṅkhya asks)—'How do you know that the Sense organs have their source in the rudimentary substances, and not in Unmanifested Primordial Matter?'

[The answer is given in the following Sūtra]

Sūtra 61

The Sense-organs are regarded as being of the same nature as the Rudimentary Substances, because there is perception (by their means) of the specific qualities of these substances

* Though the Auditory organ is nothing more than the all pervading Ākāśa yet it cannot apprehend all Sounds in the world because its scope is restricted by the disabilities of the body in which it subsists—the connection of a particular organ with a particular object being determined by the merit and demerit of the man to whom it belongs

BHĀṢYA

In the case of Air and the other rudimentary substances we find that there is a restriction as to the perception of particular qualities, e.g. Air serves to manifest Touch, Water serves to manifest Taste, Light serves to manifest Colour, as for Earth, one earthy thing (oil, f :) serves to manifest the odour of another earthy thing (the *kankuma*, f :),—this restriction as to the perception of the specific qualities of rudimentary substances is found in the case of the Sense organs also [e.g. the Olfactory Organ manifests *Odour* only, the Tactile Organ *Touch* only, and so forth], hence from the fact that there is restriction as to the perception of the specific qualities of Rudimentary Substances, we conclude that the Sense organs have their source in (are constituted by) those Substances, and not in Unmanifested Primordial Matter *

SECTION (9)

(Sūtra 62-73)

Examination of the 'Objects' of Sense-organs

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

It has been mentioned† above (in Su 1-14) that Odour etc., are the qualities of Earth, and inasmuch as this assertion would be true if Earth etc., had each only one quality, as well as

* The *Tatparya* makes the following observation—By the declaration that there are only five Sense-organs, it is implied, that the other five—Hands, Feet etc.—which also have been regarded as Sense-organs—are not Sense-organs, and the reason for this lies in the fact that they do not fulfill the conditions of the 'Sense organ', these conditions are—(1) that they should be connected with the Body (2) they should be distinct from the defects of *samkharas* and (3) they should be the direct instruments of cognition; and these (specially the last) are not present in Hands, Feet, etc.

† What this refers to is not the mere 'mention', '*uddēśa*' of the Objects, it apparently refers to their 'definition', '*lakṣaṇa*'. The *Tatparya* says—'With a view to examine the nature of objects, the *Bhāṣyakara* recalls the definition provided under Su 1-14, the mere 'mention' of objects has been made under 1-1-1. The *Parasūddhi* adds that the purpose underlying the examination of the 'objects' is the proving of the main thesis that there are several sense-organs as also the discarding of the objections against the definition of Earth etc.

if they had several qualities,* the author of the Sūtra adds the following Sūtras —

Sūtras 62 and 63

From among Odour, Taste, Colour, Touch and Sound — those ending with Touch belong to Earth (Sū 62), and [from among those ending with Touch] excluding from the beginning, one by one, they belong respectively to Water, Light and Water, and to Ākāśa belongs the latter (Sū 63)†

BHĀṢYA

'From among those ending with Touch'—this term, with its (former Nominative) case-ending changed (into the Genitive)—has to be construed along with Sū 63 §

To Ākāśa belongs the latter—i. e. Sound,—so called in reference to those ending with Touch † 'Why then is the comparative suffix 'tarop' used [when the reference is to the four qualities of Odour etc., while 'tarop' is used when one thing is referred to one other thing]?' The word is an independent positive adjective (and not a comparative term ending with 'tarop') and all that it signifies is 'that which comes after', and in Sū 1 1-14,—where all five are mentioned—'Sound' comes after

* Here the author propounds the doubt that forms the basis of the present enquiry. As regards the assertion in Sū 1 1 14 it may mean either—(1) that each one of Odour, Colour etc., belongs to each one of Earth, Light etc. or (2) that among Earth and the rest some have one quality some two or (3) that all belong to all—*I'arukā*. On this the *Parasuddhi* remarks—The question is—Is the assertion in Sū 1 1 14 meant to be *restrictive* (of one quality to one substance)? or *alternative* (one possessing one quality, one several and so forth)? or *cumulative* (all possessing all)? Or the doubt may be in regard to Odour, Colour etc.—to which of these categories do Odour &c. belong?

† These are two Sūtras—according to the *Īrtika* and also according to the *Bhāṣyatantra*.

§ This term is necessary in Sū 63 and it can be brought only from the foregoing Sūtra; there however it has the Nominative ending; hence when construed with Sū 63 its case-ending has to be changed. The meaning is that Earth has Odour, Taste, Colour and Touch, Water has Taste, Colour and Touch, Light has Colour and Touch, Air has only Touch.

‡ The term *spāṛśaparyant* of the previous Sūtra with the case-ending changed into the form '*Spāṛśaparyantebhyaḥ*', being brought in from the preceding Sūtra.

'those ending with the Touch'. Or the word may be taken as a relative term,—the reference being to 'Touch' only; the meaning being 'among those ending with Touch, that which is last, i. e. Touch,—in reference to this, Sound is 'latter'.

Sūtra 64

[*The Pūrvapakṣin objects*].—"The view expressed cannot be accepted; because all the qualities (attributed to the Substances) are not apprehended (by the Sense-organs constituted by them)."

BHĀṢYA

[*The Pūrvapakṣin, holding the view that each one of the substances, is possessed of only one quality, objects to the view put forward in the preceding Sūtra*].—"The said distribution of qualities is not right.—Why?—Because as a matter of fact, all the qualities that have been attributed to the various substances (under the preceding Sūtra) are not apprehended by the Sense-organs composed by those substances. For example, by the Olfactory Organ, which is composed of Earth, all the four qualities ending with Touch are not apprehended, it is Odour alone that is apprehended by it. Similarly with the others also."

In what manner then are the Qualities to be distributed?—asks the *Siddhāntin*.

[*The Pūrvapakṣin answers this question and propounds his theory in the next Sūtra*]

Sūtra 65

[*The Pūrvapakṣin says*].—"Inasmuch as each of the qualities subsists, one by one, in each of the Substances, one after the other,—there is no apprehension of the others."

BHĀṢYA

"As a matter of fact, from among Odour (Taste, Colour, Touch and Sound), each subsists, one by one, respectively in Earth, (Water, Light, Air, and Ākāśa) Hence 'there is no apprehension of the others'—i. e. (a) 'of the other three qualities,' (b) 'of the other two qualities' and (c) 'of the other quality', that is to say, (a) there is no apprehension, by the

* The right reading is एकेकत्वेन as found in Ss. Ms. D, in Purī Sūtra, Mss. A and B; in *Nyāyasūtrabandha*, and also in the *Vārtika*.

Olfactory Organ of Taste, Colour and Touch,—(b) there is no apprehension, by the Gestatory Organ, of Colour and Touch,—(c) there is no apprehension, by the Visual Organ, of Touch."

Question—If such is the case, then, how is it that the Rudimentary Substances (Earth and the rest) are actually perceived as possessing *several* qualities?

Answer—"The perception of several qualities is due to admixture,* that is, that Taste and the other qualities are perceived in Earth is due to the Mixture (i.e., presence therein) of particles of Water and the other substances. Similarly with the others."

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The *Siddāntin* asks]—If such be the case, then there should be no restriction, inasmuch as there is no restriction in the association of the substances, there should be no such restriction as that 'Earth has *four* qualities', 'Water has *three* qualities', 'Light has *two* qualities' and 'Air has *one* quality'

[The *Pūrvapakṣin* answers]—"Certainly restriction is possible"—How?

Sūtra 66

"Because the preceding is permeated by the succeeding"

BHĀṢYA

"As a matter of fact, among Earth (Water, Light, Air and Ākāśa), that which precedes is permeated by what succeeds it, and on account of this (restricted) mixture or association, there is restriction (in regard to the qualities) †

"All this is to be learnt from the account (contained in the *Purāṇas*) of the creation of things, and it cannot be

† This is printed as Sūtra in the Viz edition, but no such Sūtra is found anywhere, and from the *Bhāṣya* below (e.g.) it is clear that the *Pūrvapakṣa* consists of only three *sūtras*

* Earth is permeated by all the other four substances, hence all those qualities are found in it. Water is permeated by all but Earth, hence it is found to possess all qualities except *Odour*, and so with the rest

This is the explanation of the *Tātparyā*. The *Bhāṣyatandya* explains the Sūtra as—Earth is permeated by Water etc., and Water by Earth etc. But this is not in keeping with the *Bhāṣya*

directly known now (by us, since the matter is beyond the reach of our mind).”*

Sūtra 67

(*Siddhānta*)—Not so ; because the Earthy and the Aqueous Substances are both actually perceived [with distinct qualities of their own.]†

BHĀṢYA

‘Not so’—denies all that has been stated in the preceding three *Sūtras*. And the reason for this denial is given in the next phrase—*because the Earthy Substance (Earth) and Aqueous Substance (Water) are both actually perceived* [If the *Pūrvapakṣa* theory were true, and each of the Substances had only one quality, then] according to the principle that ‘Perception is due to large magnitude, to composition by several components and to Colour,’ the *Luminous Substance* (Light) alone would be perceptible, and not either Earth or Water, since the two latter are devoid of Colour (according to the *Pūrvapakṣa*, and the presence of Colour is a necessary condition of perceptibility) § As a matter of fact, however, Earth and Water are as perceptible as Light. Nor will it be right to attribute the presence of several

* Such is the explanation given by the *Tatparya*. The *Bhāṣyatandra* explains that all this peculiar creation in which the substances are associated together in this peculiar fashion is the result of God’s peculiar powers, and hence it cannot be questioned, it must be accepted as true, as described in the Scriptures.

† The *Bhāṣya* has provided four explanations of the *Sūtra*, embodying the following four statements—(a) Earth and Water are actually perceived, (b) they are perceived with distinct tastes, colours and touches, (c) they are perceived with distinct qualities of their own, and (d) each of the Substances, Earth, Water etc. is perceived as mixed up with the rest. We have adopted (c) alone in the translations as it is the widest, and as such practically includes the others.

§ Even according to the Opponent Earth, Water and Light are held to be perceptible by the Eye, but according to the view that each substance has only one quality, Earth would have Odour only, and Water would have Taste only, so that both of these being devoid of Colour, would be invisible, and Light would be the only visible substance. Nor will it be right to assert that the visibility of Earth and Water is due to their association with Light. For such association, according to the *Pūrvapakṣa*, is present in Air and Akāśa also, so that these two also should be perceptible by the Eye.—*Tatparya*.

Olfactory Organ of Taste, Colour and Touch,—(b) there is no apprehension, by the Gestatory Organ, of Colour and Touch—(c) there is no apprehension, by the Visual Organ, of Touch '.

Question—If such is the case, then, how is it that the Rudimentary Substances (Earth and the rest) are actually perceived as possessing several qualities?

Answer—"The perception of several qualities is due to admixture,* that is, that Taste and the other qualities are perceived in Earth is due to the Mixture (i.e., presence therein) of particles of Water and the other substances. Similarly with the others."

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The *Siddhāntin* asks]—If such be the case, then there should be no restriction, inasmuch as there is no restriction in the association of the substances, there should be no such restriction as that 'Earth has four qualities', 'Water has three qualities', 'Light has two qualities' and 'Air has one quality'.

[The *Pūrvapakṣin* answers]—"Certainly restriction is possible"—How?

Sūtra 66

'Because the preceding is permeated by the succeeding

BHĀṢYA

'As a matter of fact, among Earth (Water, Light, Air and Ākāśa) that which precedes is permeated by what succeeds it and on account of this (restricted) mixture or association, there is restriction (in regard to the qualities) †

'All this is to be learnt from the account (contained in the Puranas) of the creation of things and it cannot be

† This is printed as Sūtra in the Viz edition, but no such Sūtra is found anywhere and from the *Bhāṣya* below (e.g.) it is clear that the *Pūrvapakṣa* consists of only three Sūtras.

* Earth is permeated by all the other four substances hence all those qualities are found in it. Water is permeated by all but Earth hence it is found to possess all qualities except Odour and so with the rest.

This is the explanation of the *Tatparyā*. The *Bhāṣyānandra* explains the Sūtra as—Earth is permeated by Water etc. and Water by Earth etc. But this is not in keeping with the *Bhāṣya*.

directly known now (by us, since the matter is beyond the reach of our mind).”*

Sūtra 67

(*Siddhānta*)—Not so, because the Earthy and the Aqueous Substances are both actually perceived [with distinct qualities of their own]†

BHĀṢYA

‘Not so’—denies all that has been stated in the preceding three *Sūtras*. And the reason for this denial is given in the next phrase—*because the Earthy Substance (Earth) and Aqueous Substance (Water) are both actually perceived* [If the *Pūrvapakṣa* theory were true, and each of the Substances had only one quality, then] according to the principle that ‘Perception is due to large magnitude, to composition by several components and to Colour,’ the *Luminous Substance* (Light) alone would be perceptible, and not either Earth or Water, since the two latter are devoid of Colour (according to the *Pūrvapakṣa*, and the presence of Colour is a necessary condition of perceptibility)‡. As a matter of fact, however, Earth and Water are as perceptible as Light. Nor will it be right to attribute the presence of several

* Such is the explanation given by the *Tatparya*. The *Bhāṣyacandra* explains that all this peculiar creation in which the substances are associated together in this peculiar fashion is the result of God’s peculiar powers, and hence it cannot be questioned, it must be accepted as true, as described in the Scriptures.

† The *Bhāṣya* has provided four explanations of the *Sūtra*, embodying the following four statements—(a) Earth and Water are actually perceived, (b) they are perceived with distinct tastes, colours and touches, (c) they are perceived with distinct qualities of their own and (d) each of the Substances, Earth, Water etc. is perceived as mixed up with the rest. We have adopted (c) alone in the translations as it is the widest, and as such practically includes the others.

‡ Even according to the Opponent Earth, Water and Light are held to be perceptible by the Eye, but according to the view that each substance has only one quality, Earth would have Odour only, and Water would have Taste only, so that both of these being devoid of Colour, would be invisible, and Light would be the only visible substance. Nor will it be right to assert that the visibility of Earth and Water is due to their association with Light. For such association, according to the *Pūrvapakṣa*, is present in Air and Akāśa also, so that these two also should be perceptible by the Eye—*Tatparya*.

qualities in a substance to its association with other substances because if one holds that the perceptibility of Earth and Water is due to the presence therein of such Colour as belongs to another substance (Light) which is mixed with it,—then for him, Air also should be equally perceptible, or you should find some explanation for the restriction (that while Earth and Water are perceptible, Air is not perceptible) [the condition of perceptibility, in the shape of mixture with Light, being equally present in all the three]

(b) Or, the clause '*because the Earthy and the Aqueous are perceived*' may mean 'because distinct tastes of Earth and Water are perceived, i.e., as a matter of fact, the taste of Earth is of six kinds, while that of Water is only sweet, and this could not be, if the two were actually mixed up. Or, *because distinct Colours of Earth and Water are perceived*, while if the Colour of Earth and Water were due only to the Colour of the Light mixed up with them, then such Colour would serve only to illumine (render perceptible) other things, and it would itself not be illumined (and perceived),'* as a matter of fact however the Colours of Earth and Water are *actually perceived*, as being of several kinds and of only one kind respectively, e.g. the Colour of Earthy things is of several kinds, green, red, yellow and so forth, while the Colour of Water is only white, and that also illuminative in its character—such a phenomenon is never found in the case of Substances consisting only of the mixture of several substances, each endowed with only one quality)

The Sutra has mentioned 'Earth' and 'Water' only by way of illustration. The same is true of other things also which we proceed to show in detail.

The reason for our denying the Purvapakṣa is—*because of Earth and Light, distinct touches are perceived*, i.e. the touch of Earth is *neither hot nor-cold*, while that of Light is *actually perceived as hot*, and no such phenomenon would be possible

* For the Colour of Light is only White-light which while itself not perceptible, renders other things perceptible. Hence if the Colour in Earth and Water were only the Colour of Light, it would not be itself perceived while the Colour of Earth and Water are *actually perceived*; these Colours must belong to something other than Light.

if both (Earth and Fire) were mixed up with Air, which is neither-hot-nor-cold

(c) Or, the phrase, 'because the Earthy and Aqueous substances are perceived,' may mean that *both these substances, Earth and Water, are actually perceived with distinct qualities of their own*, e.g. Earthy things are perceived with four qualities, and Aqueous things are perceived with only three, and from this we conclude that the *constituent Earth* (of the Earthy substance) is also endowed with those same (four) qualities, because the finished product is indicative of the nature of its cause, which, by reason of its being the cause, is regarded as modifiable (into that product). Similarly, inasmuch as the Earthy and Luminous Substances are perceived as possessed of distinct qualities, we conclude that the constituents of these also must be possessed of these same distinct qualities.

(d) Or, [The Sūtra may be explained to mean that] a difference is actually perceived between Earthy and Aqueous substances, both of which are distinctly perceived, that is to say, it is actually perceived that Earthy Substances are mixed up with Water (Light and Air),—that Aqueous Substances are mixed up with other two substances (Light and Air),—and Luminous Substances are mixed up with Air, and not a single substance is ever found to be possessed of only one quality.

As for the reasoning propounded in Sū 66—"because the preceding is permeated by the succeeding [restriction of qualities becomes possible]"—it is no reasoning at all, because we do not find in it any reason leading up to the conclusion,—on the strength whereof we could accept the Proposition. As for the assertion (made by the Opponent, in the *Bhāṣya*, on Sū 66)—"that the preceding is permeated by the succeeding is to be learnt from the account, contained in the Purāṇas, of the creation of the things, and it cannot be directly known now"—is not right* because there would be no ground for the restriction [that Odour only should subsist in Earth, that it subsists in Earth only, and so forth] * Further,

* The *Bhāṣyasāra* explains the passage as translated. The *Tatparyā* offers a somewhat different explanation—"There is no evidence according to you in support of the view that Odour subsists in Earth only, for the

it is actually seen even now that 'the preceding substance is permeated by the succeeding,' e. g., Light (Fire) is permeated by Air [so that the assertion referred to is not true, being contrary to a fact of perception] Then again, 'permeation' is only a kind of *contact*, and this is equal to both, so that there can be no explanation for the fact that, while Light becomes endowed with Touch by reason of its being permeated by Air Air does not become endowed with Colour, though it is permeated by Light Further, it is actually seen that the Touch of Air (which is neither hot nor cold) is suppressed by the Touch of Light (which is hot), and becomes imperceptible (by reason of that suppression), and certainly a thing cannot be suppressed by itself [and this is what the said phenomenon would mean if the touch of Light were due to its permeation by Air, as in that case the said suppression would mean that the Touch of Air is suppressed by the Touch of Air]

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Having thus repudiated a theory opposed to all reason the *Sūtra* next turns to answer the argument (put forward under Su 64)—that "the view cannot be accepted, because all the qualities (attributed to Substances) are not apprehended by the Sense organs constituted by them"—

Sūtra 68

Inasmuch as from among the qualities [of the organs of Olfaction, Gestation, Vision, Touch and Audition] there is an excess (in each Organ) of each of the qualities [Odour, Taste, Colour, Touch and Sound], one by one in the order in which they are mentioned—each Organ is regarded as preponderating in that quality *

only arguments that you propound are against such a conception, hence the account of the creation of things referred to you must be taken as figurative not literally true

* We have translated the *Sūtra* according to the interpretation of the *Bhāṣya*. The *Vartika* does not accept this view, on the ground that— if the predominance of an Organ consisted of its apprehending a certain object then all Organs would be equally predominant for every Organ apprehends its object. But the *Vartika* apparently misunderstands the expression *tattatpradhanam* of the *Bhāṣya*—it does not mean that each of the Organs respectively is predominant as the *Vartika* seems to take it—but that each

BHĀṢYA

Hence [because of the fact mentioned in the Sutra] there can be no apprehension (by any sense organ) of all qualities. Among the qualities of the Olfactory and other Organs—*i. e.*, among Odour and the rest—there being an excess (in each Organ) of the preceding quality (over the succeeding qualities)—each organ is regarded as preponderating in that quality.

"What does this *predominance* mean?"

It means that the Organ is capable of apprehending that object.

"What is meant by the 'excess' of a quality in an Organ?"

It means that that Organ has the capacity of manifesting (rendering cognisable) that quality.

[The meaning of the Sutra thus is as follows]—Just as the external substances of Earth, Water and Light,—which are endowed respectively with four, three and two qualities—are capable of manifesting not all these qualities, but only Odour, Taste and Colour, respectively,—and this is on account of the fact that in these substances there is an excess of the qualities of Odour, Taste and Colour, respectively,—in the same manner the Organs of Olfaction, Gestation and Vision—which are endowed respectively with four, three and two qualities—are capable of apprehending not all qualities, but only Odour, Taste and Colour respectively,—and thus on account of the fact that

of the Organs has that for its predominant quality, and this predominance is indicated by the Sense organ manifesting that only and thus is not open to the objection urged in the *Vartika*. Further the *Vartika* explanation has no point, if the Olfactory Organ is predominant as endowed with the largest number of qualities (four)—what can that have to do with its apprehending Odour only, which is the point at issue? In fact, that it is endowed with four qualities should make it capable of apprehending all those qualities. The *Tatparya* has attempted to justify the *Vartika's* interpretation.

The *Bhāṣyatandya* follows the *Vartika* but *Vishvanātha* accepts the *Bhāṣya*. *Vardhamana* also in the *Nyāyambandhanaprakāśa* offers the following explanation of the Sutra—"Inasmuch as among the qualities of the Olfactory and other Sense organs there is an excess of the preceding over the succeeding qualities, each of the Organs is predominant through that quality, hence it cannot apprehend all qualities—it can apprehend only that quality (in its manifested form) whose presence imparts to it the said predominance."

in each of the Organs there is an excess of those qualities Odour, Taste and Colour respectively—Hence [inasmuch as the Organs are not possessed of the capacity of apprehending all qualities] there can be no apprehension, by the Olfactory and other Organs, of all qualities

[On the other hand] If one holds that—‘ the Olfactory Organ apprehends Odour, *because it is endowed with Odour*, and so on with the Gestatory and other Organs ’—then, it should be possible for each of the other Organs, of Olfaction and the rest, to apprehend all the qualities that it is endowed with* [which would not meet the Opponent’s objection]

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The question now arises—“To what is this restriction due—that only one organ is composed of the *Earth*, and not all?—that only a few are composed of Water and Light particles and not all? ”† *Answer*—

Sūtra 69

The restriction (as to one organ being composed of Earth and so forth) is due to preponderance (i.e. singularity) §

* Under the theory noticed—according to which the fact that the Olfactory Organ apprehends Odour *because it is possessed of Odour*, and not because there is an excess of Odour in it—the Organ should apprehend all the four qualities of Odour Taste Colour and Touch with which it is held to be endowed So that the contingency of one Organ apprehending all qualities would remain possible

† The question simply means that one organ (Olfactory) is held to be composed of Earth the Gestatory Organ of Water the Visual Organ of Light and so forth now to what is all this restriction due? Agreeably to this the *Tatparya* puts the question as— Whence do you get at the restriction that it is the Olfactory Organ alone that apprehends Odour? The *Varṭika* and *Vishvanatha* put the question differently— Why is not every substance composed of Earth regarded as the Olfactory Organ? The *Bhāṣyacandra* and the *Nyāyasūtratīkaraṇa* put the question in the simplest form— What are the reasons for regarding the Olfactory Organ alone as composed of Earth the Gestatory Organ alone as composed of Water and so forth? With the exception of the *Varṭika* and *Vishvanātha* all are in agreement with the *Bhāṣya*

§ The *Bhāṣya* has explained the expression *bhūyatrāt* of the Sūtra to mean *prākṛṣṭatrāt* due to superiority or singularity Would it not be simpler to take it as meaning simply *preponderance*?—the argument being that the Olfactory Organ is regarded as of Earth because Earth forms the

BHĀṢYA

[In the formation of a thing] there is a coming together (amalgamation) of such distinct substances as are capable of bringing about the requisite thing—this amalgamation being regulated by the destiny (merit-demerit) of men (to whom the thing is to belong), it is *this amalgamation of distinct substances* that constitutes the 'preponderance [which means 'singularity']—of the thing. the word 'preponderance' is found to be used in the sense of 'singularity' or 'excellence', e.g., an *excellent* thing is called 'preponderating'. For instance such things as Poison, Medicinal Plant, Gem and so forth, which are produced under the influence of the destiny of Men are capable of accomplishing distinct purposes, and all things do not accomplish all purposes. In the same manner when the Olfactory and other organs are produced, they are capable of apprehending only certain distinct things,—and not all things.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Question — "Why is it that the Sense organs do not apprehend their own qualities?"

[The answer is given by the following Sutra]—

Sutra 70

Because it is only as endowed with qualities that the Sense-organs are what they are

BHĀṢYA

The Olfactory and other organs do not, as a matter of fact, apprehend their own qualities, Odour and the rest. If you ask — 'Why is this so?' — our answer is that it is only as endowed with their respective qualities that the Olfactory and other Organs are regarded as 'Sense organs'. That is to say, the

preponderating element in its constitution. In view of this we have translated the said expression as preponderance which is its natural signification and placed the *Bhāṣya* rendering as a parenthetical explanation.

* If, for instance the Olfactory Organ is as the Siddhāntin holds endowed with Odour how is it that the Organ does not perceive this Odour present in itself?

Visvanātha introduces the Sūtra somewhat differently — The Sūtra proceeds to prove that the Sense organs are actually endowed with the qualities of Odour, etc.

Olfactory Organ apprehends outside Odour, only when it is itself accompanied by Odour which serves the same purpose (of making perceptible the Odour, of other things) as the organ itself, so that it cannot apprehend its own Odour, for the simple reason that in this the necessary auxiliary (in the shape of its own Odour) would be wanting. Similarly with the other sense-organs

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

If it be held that—"The Odour of the Olfactory Organ would itself be the requisite auxiliary also",—then our answer is—

Sūtra 71

Because a thing cannot be apprehended by itself

BHĀṢYA

There can be no apprehension, by the Sense-organs, of their own qualities. In fact, the assertion made is exactly like the statement—"Just as an external substance is apprehended by the Eye, so, by the Eye, that same Eye itself should be apprehended, for in both cases (the apprehension of the Eye by itself, and of the organ's quality by itself), the causes of requisite apprehension are wanting [i.e., The quality, forming an integral part of the Sense organ cannot be apprehended by the same organ, nothing can operate upon itself]

Sūtra 72

[Objection]—"What is asserted cannot be accepted, because the quality of Sound is actually perceived"

BHĀṢYA

"It is not true that the Sense-organs do not apprehend their own qualities, because Sound is apprehended by the Auditory Organ, and yet it is its own quality [Sound being the quality of Ākāśa, and the Auditory Organ being nothing other than Ākāśa]"

Sūtra 73

Answer—The said apprehension is due to the fact of the quality (Sound) and the substance (Ākāśa) being unlike other qualities and substances

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, it is not as endowed with a particular Sound that Ākāśa becomes the (Auditory) Sense-organ possessed

* of a quality,* and Sound is not the manifest of Sound [so that the Auditory organ consisting of Ākāśa differs from the other organs consisting of Earth etc., because it is only as possessed of Odour that Earth constitutes the Olfactory organ, and so forth, while Ākāśa forms the Auditory organ by its very nature,—and Sound also differs from Odour]

Further, that the Olfactory and other organs apprehend their own qualities is known neither by Perception, nor by Inference, while as regards the Ākāśa of the Auditory organ, we do know, by Inference, that Sound is apprehended by it and Sound is the quality of Ākāśa. The Inference that leads to this Cognition is that which operates by elimination [among the Substances that could be regarded as the Auditory organ, to which alone Sound could belong as a quality] the Soul is the *hearer*, and not the *instrument* (of hearing) [Hence the Soul can not be the Auditory organ],—if the Mind were the Auditory organ, then (Mind being imperishable) there would be no possibility of deafness,—as regards Earth (Water Light and Air), though they have the capacity of becoming (composing) the organs of Olfaction and the rest, they do not have the capacity of forming the Auditory organ,—*Ākāśa* thus is the only substance left,—hence it is concluded that it is *Ākāśa* that forms the Auditory Organ

* That is, it is not by reason of its having Sound for its quality that the Auditory organ is an organ of perception, by its very nature is the Auditory organ Ākāśa. The quality of Sound that belongs to Ākāśa of the Auditory organ could not be the same that is apprehended by it

Olfactory Organ apprehends outside Odour, only when it is itself accompanied by Odour which serves the same purpose (of making perceptible the Odour, of other things) as the organ itself, so that it cannot apprehend its own Odour, for the simple reason that in this the necessary auxiliary (in the shape of its own Odour) would be wanting. Similarly with the other sense-organs

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

If it be held that—"The Odour of the Olfactory Organ would itself be the requisite auxiliary also",—then our answer is—

Sūtra 71

Because a thing cannot be apprehended by itself

BHĀṢYA

There can be no apprehension, by the Sense-organs, of their own qualities. In fact, the assertion made is exactly like the statement—"Just as an external substance is apprehended by the Eye, so, by the Eye, that same Eye itself should be apprehended," for in both cases (the apprehension of the Eye by itself, and of the organ's quality by itself), the causes of requisite apprehension are wanting [i.e., The quality, forming an integral part of the Sense organ, cannot be apprehended by the same organ, nothing can operate upon itself]

Sūtra 72

[Objection]—"What is asserted cannot be accepted, because the quality of Sound is actually perceived"

BHĀṢYA

"It is not true that the Sense-organs do not apprehend their own qualities, because Sound is apprehended by the Auditory Organ, and yet it is its own quality [Sound being the quality of Ākāśa, and the Auditory Organ being nothing other than Ākāśa]"

Sūtra 73

Answer—The said apprehension is due to the fact of the quality (Sound) and the substance (Ākāśa) being unlike other qualities and substances

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, it is not as endowed with a particular Sound that Ākāśa becomes the (Auditory) Sense-organ possessed

of a quality,* and Sound is not the manifest of Sound [so that the Auditory organ consisting of Ākāśa differs from the other organs consisting of Earth etc, because it is only as possessed of Odour that Earth constitutes the Olfactory organ, and so forth; while Ākāśa forms the Auditory organ by its very nature,—and Sound also differs from Odour]

Further, that the Olfactory and other organs apprehend their own qualities is known neither by Perception, nor by Inference, while as regards the Ākāśa of the Auditory organ, we do know, by Inference, that Sound is apprehended by it, and Sound is the quality of Ākāśa. The Inference that leads to this Cognition is that which operates by elimination [among the Substances that could be regarded as the Auditory organ, to which alone Sound could belong as a quality] the Soul is the *hearer*, and not the *instrument* (of hearing) [Hence the Soul can not be the Auditory organ],—if the Mind were the Auditory organ, then (Mind being imperishable) there would be no possibility of deafness,—as regards Earth (Water, Light and Air), though they have the capacity of becoming (composing) the organs of Olfaction and the rest, they do not have the capacity of forming the Auditory organ,—*Ākāśa* thus is the only substance left,—hence it is concluded that it is *Ākāśa* that forms the Auditory Organ

* That is, it is not by reason of its having Sound for its quality that the Auditory organ is an organ of perception, by its very nature it is the Auditory organ Ākāśa. The quality of Sound that belongs to Ākāśa of the Auditory organ could not be the same that is apprehended by it

DISCOURSE III
DAILY LESSON II

SECTION 1

Transient Character of Buddhi—Cognition

Sūtras 1-9

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The *Sense organs* and *Objects* have been fully examined, now it is the turn of the Examination of *Buddhi*, Cognition. And the first question that arises is—Is Cognition eternal or non eternal?

“Why should there be this doubt?”

Sūtra 1

The Doubt arises by reason of the similarity (of Cognition) to Action and *Ākāśa**

BHĀṢYA

(a) The ‘similarity’ of Cognition to Action and *Ākāśa* consists in *intangibility*, (b) and further, in Apprehension we do not perceive any such definite character as either *liability to production and destruction*—which would mark it as *non-eternal*—or the contrary [*i.e.*, *non-liability to production and destruction*] which would mark it as *eternal*, hence [all necessary conditions of

* The Agent (Soul), the Instrument (the sense-organs) and the Objects of Apprehension or Cognition having been duly examined it is now the turn of the examination of the nature of Cognition or Apprehension itself.—*Bhāṣyasandra*

The things outside the Body having been examined, the Author next proceeds to examine those within the Body—says the *Paribuddhi*. On this *Varāhamāna* makes the following observations—

When it is said that the things now going to be examined exist in the Body it cannot mean that they subsist or inhere in it as in this sense Cognition and Mind cannot be said to exist in the body, nor can it mean that they are in physical contact with it, as this would not be true of Cognition, and also because many external things also are in contact with the Body. What is meant is that the coming Lesson deals with such objects of Cognition as are distinguished by the character of being the cause of experiences in connection with the Body. Such examination is conducive to that Disguist for things which is a necessary step towards Final Release

Doubt, described under Sū 1-1-23, being present] the said Doubt arises.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[An objection is raised against the above question]—"The doubt put forward is groundless, it is a fact known to every living being that Cognition is transient, being just like Pleasure and such experiences, every man has such notions as—'I shall now', 'I know' and 'I have known', and the connection with the three points of time (involved in these conceptions) would not be possible if Cognition were *not liable to production and destruction*. So that it is not true that we do not find in Cognition the *liability to production and destruction*],* hence, inasmuch as Cognition is related to all three points of time (being, as it is liable to production, existence and destruction), it follows as an established conclusion that it is *non-eternal*. Further, in the *Nyāya-sūtra* itself it has been asserted as a well substantiated fact—(a) that 'Cognition is produced by the contact of the Sense organs, and the Object' (Sū 1-1-16), and (b) that the non-simultaneous production of Cognitions indicates the existence of Mind' (Sū 1 1 16) [wherein it is taken for granted that Cognitions are *produced* from which it follows that Cognition is *not-eternal*], so that no further doubt and discussion should be called for "

* The three notions mentioned imply that there is *production* of Cognition (as involved in the notion 'I shall know' which means that the Cognition shall be produced), there is *Continuity* of Cognition (as expressed by 'I know' which means that Cognition is *present*), and there is *destruction* of Cognition (as expressed by 'I have known', which means that the Cognition has come to an end) —*Bhāṣya*

The *Tatparya* puts the question somewhat differently —'If by *buddhi*' in the present context, you mean the individual cognition of things, then the whole discussion becomes pointless, as no one holds such notions to be other than momentary. If, on the other hand, you mean *Buddhi*, the *Mahat* of the *Sāṅkhya*, then, before discussing the character of such a thing, it behoves you to discuss its very existence: as the *Sāṅkhya* does not admit of any such universal Cosmic Principle as the *Mahat* of the *Sāṅkhya*.

Vardhamāna has some observations to make in regard to the exact words in which the subject matter of the discussion should be stated. In the sentence—'Is *Buddhi* eternal or non-eternal,' the term '*buddhi*' like every other term, denotes the Universal '*buddhata*', and as this latter is eternal, according to all parties, there is no occasion for doubt on this matter.

Our answer (in justification of the present enquiry) is that the present enquiry is for the purpose of refuting the unreasonable assertions based upon false speculation, the Sankhyas, speculating, in the realms of philosophy, assert that—"Buddhi, the Internal Organ of Man, is eternal", and they also put forward arguments in support of this assertion, as in the following *Sūtra*.*

Sūtra 2

"Because there is re-cognition of things."

BHĀṢYA

"What is this 're cognition'? 'Re-cognition' is the name of that re collective cognition which is involved in the conception that we have in regard to one and the same thing, in the form—"I now cognise the same thing that I had cognised before" Such

Nor can the question be stated in the form—'Is the word *buddhi* one whose denotation is eternal, or is it one whose denotation is not eternal?' Because it is possible to give the name to a person, whereby the physical body of that person would form the denotation of the word '*buddhi*', and certainly there could be no question of this denotation being eternal. Some people have stated the question in the form—"Is the denotation of the term *buddhi*, which is the substratum of the *Universal buddhivā*, eternal or non eternal?' The Author himself would favour the question in the form—"Is cognition co substrate with I ness or not? According to the *Sāṅkhya*, the *Buddhi tattva* is the substratum of Cognition which is something different from the *Ātman*, and as such not co substrate with I-ness.

* Whether *Buddhi* is eternal or non-eternal is not the main subject of our present enquiry, this has been introduced only as a preliminary issue, which serves to establish the conclusion that there is no such thing as the Cosmic Thinking Principle, the *Mahat* which the *Sāṅkhya* posits as something distinct from the ephemeral Cognitions of things. The fact of the matter is that if *Buddhi* were something eternal then it would certainly be something different from the momentarily appearing and disappearing cognitions,—if on the other hand, the grounds put forward in proof of the eternity of *Buddhi*, are found to be incapable of establishing it, then there would be no justification for postulating any Universal Thinking Principle apart from the Cognitions, and it becomes established that '*Buddhi*' and 'Cognition' are synonymous terms, as declared by the *Nāyayika* in *Su* 1-1-15. It is in this manner also that the present enquiry becomes connected with the definition of *Buddhi* set forth in the *Sūtra* (1-1-15). There would be no such relevancy in the enquiry if it pertained merely to the eternity or non-eternity of *Buddhi* —*Tatparya*

re collective cognition can be possible only when Cognition is eternal, for if there were several divergent Cognitions, capable of being produced and destroyed, no 're cognition' would be possible for a thing *cognised* by one cannot be *re-cognised* by another".*

Sūtra 3

[The Sīdhāntin's answer to the Sāṅkhya argument]

Inasmuch as what has been put forward is itself still to be proved, it cannot be accepted as a valid reason

BHĀṢYA

Just as the 'eternality' of *Buddhi* is 'still to be proved,' so is also the fact that 're-cognition belongs to *Buddhi* 'still to be proved', i.e., not proved [it cannot be admitted] —why so?—because what belongs to an intelligent being cannot be attributed to an instrument as a matter of fact, *Buddhi*—which is spoken of as *jāna* (Cognition), '*darshana*' (Perception), '*apalabdhī*' (Apprehension), '*bodha*' (Understanding) '*pratyaya* (Cognizance), and '*adhyavasāya*' (Ascertainment),—is a quality of, and belongs to, the conscious Person, and it is only the conscious Person that *re cognises* what he has *cognised* before, so that it is to this conscious Person only that eternality can be attributed, on the ground of recognition † If it be held that 'Consciousness' (or Intelligence) belongs to the instrument [and not to the Soul, so that Recognition also would belong to the Instrument],—then it becomes necessary to explain the exact nature of the conscious (intelligent) being, for unless you define the exact nature of the 'Conscious Being', you cannot posit a totally different‡ Soul (a Personality or conscious Being totally different from

* And according to the Sāṅkhya, *Buddhi* is eternal and yet capable of under going modifications, by virtue of which it becomes connected with the several cognitions involved in Re-cognition. This would not be possible of the Soul, which is eternal, unmodifiable —*Tatparya*

† It is the Person that *recognises*, 'recognition' belongs to him, hence if 'recognition proves eternality, this eternality can belong only to the Conscious Person and not to *Buddhi*, which, as the Internal Organ is a mere instrument, for this simple reason this *Buddhi* does not appear in the Recognition at all —*Tatparya*

‡ The Naiyāyika posits one kind of Conscious Being in the shape of the Soul, the Opponent now posits the 'Conscious Being' in the shape of the Instrument, the Internal Organ. Before this can be accepted, the Opponent should explain what he exactly means by the 'Conscious Being'.

what is generally regarded as the Conscious Being) That is to say, if it be held that Cognition (Consciousness) belongs to the Internal Organ in the shape of the Mind, we ask you—of this 'conscious being' of yours, what is the exact form, what the character, and what the exact nature? And what does this 'Conscious Being' do with the cognition subsisting in the *Buddhi*?

If it be held that—"it cognises, *cēṭayate*,"—our answer is that this expression would in no way differ from '*jāñña*', 'cognition', that is to say, the two expressions—"the man cognises" and '*Buddhi knows*'—would both connote *cognition*, and nothing else,* as the words *cēṭayate* ('cognises') '*jāñite*', (knows) '*budhyate*' (understands), '*paśyati*' (perceives), '*apalabhate*' (apprehends),—all mean one and the same thing "But *Buddhi* is what *makes things known*" That is just so, the *Person knows* and the *Buddhi makes known* things, but (under this theory) it thus becomes established that Cognition belongs to the Person (as held by the Siddhāntin), and *not* to the Internal Organ, '*Buddhi*' (as held by the Purvapakṣin) †

[It having been proved that Cognition belongs to the person and not to *Buddhi*, the Author proceeds to refute the view that the actions denoted by the terms 'cognition', 'apprehension', 'understanding', are different from one another, and as such should belong to different entities]—If it be held that each of the actions denoted by the terms (above-mentioned) belong to distinct individual persons,—then it behoves you to show cause for your denial (of the view that they belong to the one and the same person) That is to say, if the Opponent holds the view that—"one person does the *cognising*, another the *understanding*, a third the *apprehending*, and a fourth the *perceiving*",—then it comes to this that all these persons,—the *cogniser*, the *under-*

* 'What is spoken of as *cognising*, i.e., the Person, is nothing different from what is spoken of as *knowing*, i.e., *Buddhi*, so that '*Buddhi*' and 'Person' become 'synonymous terms' This is the explanation of the *Bhāṣyacandra*

† One is said to 'know', when he brings about cognition in himself while one is said to 'make known' things when it brings about cognition in others, so that these two being totally different, *cognition* cannot belong to *Buddhi*, which, *ex-hypothesi*, only *makes things known*."—*Bhāṣyacandra*

stander, the apprehender and the perceiver—are so many distinct persons, and the corresponding qualities (of Cognition and the rest) do not belong to one and the same person. Such being your view, (we ask you)—what is your reason for this denial? If you put forward “the non difference of denotation” as your reason,—then the same may be said for us also. That is, if what you mean is that—“inasmuch as the words cognises, apprehends etc denote the same thing, it cannot be right to attribute (and restrict) them all to one and the same Person [and there would be no sense in predicating so many synonymous terms in reference to the same Agent]”,—then the same fact (of sameness of denotation) may be equally urged against you also. For in the two expressions, ‘the person cognises, celayate’, and ‘the Buddhi knows, jānāti’, there is no difference in the denotation of the terms ‘cognises’ and ‘knows’, so that both (Person and Buddhi) being equally Cognitive or Conscious Beings, [there being no reason for predicating one of the Person, and the other of the Buddhi] one of the two must be rejected [and Cognition should be attributed to one only] *

* This passage is somewhat obscure, the obscurity being enhanced by the reading of the text. Several manuscripts, as also the *Varūka*, read ‘arthasyabheda ita samānam, abhinnavartha etc etc’. The only meaning that can be deduced from this text is as translated above we have adopted this in the body of the text, in deference to the *Varūka*. Several other manuscripts, however, among them the two *Puri Mss*, and also the *Bhāṣyatandra*, read ‘arthasya bheda ita etc etc’. Apparently this is the better reading, because the proposition that the ‘several qualities do not belong to the same individual’ can be supported by the fact that the qualities expressed by the terms are different, if it were the same single quality denoted by them all, then there would be nothing wrong in predicating all the terms of the same individual. The difficulty in this reading, however, is that the repeated reference to the argument of the preceding clause is found, in all manuscripts in the form ‘abhinnavartha etc’, which shows that the preceding clause must be ‘arthasyabheda’. The *Bhāṣyatandra* has made an attempt to construe this passage according to its own reading by which the translation should stand thus —“There is a difference in the denotation of the terms cognises etc, which are not synonymous,—if this is what you mean, then we may make a similar assertion: the words in question are synonymous [this assertion being as reasonable as yours, that they are not synonymous], and hence it is not possible to make any distinction (either as to the qualities denoted by the words or to the entities to whom the qualities belong). If you admit this (well-established fact),

If (with a view to escape from the above difficulties) it be held that—"the name 'buddhi' stands for the Mind, being explained as '*budhyate anayā*', *that by means of which things are cognised* [i.e. it is the *Instrument*, not the *Agent* of cognition]; and the Mind is certainly eternal"—then our answer is that that may be so* (the Mind may be eternal), but the eternality of the Mind is not proved by *the recognition of things* (which has been urged by the Opponent as the reason for the eternality of *Buddhi*),—specially because as a matter of fact, we find *Recognition* appearing even when there is a diversity of *Instruments*, only if the Cognitive Agent happens to be the same [so that Recognition cannot imply or prove the sameness and continuity of the *Instrument*],—for as asserted in Su 317,—'there is *recognition*, with the right eye, of what has been seen with the left'—an assertion made in regard to the Eye, but equally true of the Lamp also, there being recognition, of a thing previously seen with the help of one lamp, with the help of another. From all this it follows that what has been put forward by the Opponent (i.e. 'the recognition of things') is a reason for the eternality of the *Cognitive Agent* (Soul), and not for that of the *Instrument*, *Buddhi*.)

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The view has been held (by the *Sāṅkhya*) that—"From out of the eternal '*Buddhi*', there go forth, in reference to the single object cognised, emanations, which constitute the Cognitions' of those objects,—and that the Emanation' is nothing different from the Source from which it proceeds'—This however—

then the same may be said (in connection with what we are going to point out) That is in the two expressions, the Person cognises and the *Buddhi* knows there is no difference in the denotation of the two terms cognises and knows so that both *Buddhi* and Person being cognitive entities one or the other must be rejected (not regarded as really cognitive) [there being no room for two cognitive entities in the same body]

It will be found that both these explanations involve a certain amount of forced construction. In that which has been adopted in the body of the text, the explanation of the phrase *vyavasthānupapattiḥ* is not entirely satisfactory while the *Bhāṣyatandra* in several places has been forced to give up the construction of the passage which appears to be the most natural, and most in keeping with the style of the *Bhāṣya*.

* The Purī Mss and the *Bhāṣyatandra* read *astyetadevam* which means 'Mind is eternal' we admit that

Sūtra 4

is not right ; because there is no simultaneous cognition of things.

BHĀṢYA

If the 'Emanation' and its source were non-different,—then, inasmuch as the Source (Buddhi) is, *ex hypothesi*, eternal, the Emanations also should be always present (eternal), which would mean that all the cognitions of things that we have are eternal ; and if this is so, then, the cognitions of things should be simultaneous [which is an absurdity]

Sūtra 5

[Otherwise] the cessation of the cognition* would mean the destruction (cessation of the existence) (of the Internal Organ, Buddhi).

BHĀṢYA

[If Cognitions were not eternal, even though the same as *Buddhi*, then], whenever the Cognition (Emanation from Buddhi) ceases to exist (as it must, being transient), the 'Source of Emanation' also should cease to exist and this would mean that the Internal Organ (Buddhi, which is the source from which the Emanations in the shape of Cognitions, proceed) is destroyed. On the contrary [i.e. if even on the cessation of the *Emanation*, its source continues to exist], the two should have to be regarded as different from each other.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, the Mind, which is of limited magnitude (not all-pervading), comes into contact with the several sense-organs,† one by one (and at distinct points of time), so that—

Sūtra 6

inasmuch as the process is gradual, the apprehension is not simultaneous.—

BHĀṢYA

that is, of the objects of sense-perception. Hence it follows that the 'Emanation' and its 'Source' are distinct from each

* Here, as in Sū. 7, '*pratyabhiyāna*' stands for cognition in general.

† i. e. with the Soul, and the Sense-organs—says the *Dhātvyatendra*.

other, for if they were one and the same, there would be no appearance and disappearance of them (which would be incompatible with the afore mentioned *gradual process*) *

Sūtra 7

The non-apprehension of one thing is due to (the Mind) being occupied with other things.

BHĀṢYA

The term '*apratyabhijñāna*' here stands for 'non-apprehension' (and not for *non recognition*). The 'non-apprehension' of a certain object is explained on the assumption that (at that time) the Mind is occupied with some other object, and this (explanation) is possible only on the presumption that the Emanation is something different from its Source, for if the two were one and the same, there would be no force in any previous 'occupation with other objects'

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

† If the Mind were all pervading, its gradual contact with the Sense-organs, one by one,

Sūtra 8

would not be possible, because there is no movement—

* The clear meaning of the *Sūtra* and *Bhāṣya* is as translated, the term '*indriyarthanam*' being syntactically construed with the '*grahanam*' of the *Sūtra*. The *Bhāṣyatandira* however offers a different construction. According to it the words of the *Bhāṣya* have no syntactical connection with those of the *Sūtra*, and the first sentence of the *Bhāṣya* is to be construed as—*indriyarthanam nanātvam* (there is diversity in the Sense organs and in the objects of perception), *ṛtistṛtmatasā nanātvam* (there is diversity between the substratum of the emanation and the emanations themselves—i.e. the contact and the resultant cognition).

† This anticipates the argument that the mere fact of the Mind's contact with the Sense-organs being gradual does not necessarily imply that the Mind is not all pervading, and yet it would be possible to have contact with the Sense organs, one by one. The sense of the refutation is that this is not possible—the term '*Samyogaḥ*' of the *Bhāṣya* being syntactically connected with the '*na*' of the *Sūtra*. The gradual contact of a thing with another thing pre-supposes *movement*—moving from one place to the other—on the part of the former, no such movement is possible for a thing which is all pervading, i.e., occupying all points in space, it cannot, and need not, move from one place to another. Hence if Mind were all-pervading, it could not have movement, and hence it could not have gradual contact with the Sense-organs.

BHĀṢYA

The Sense-organs (before becoming operative) have to be got at by the Internal Organ, and the *moving*, necessary for this *getting at* something, cannot be present (in the Mind, if it is all-pervading), so that gradual operation being impossible, there can be no explanation for the (well known) fact of apprehension being *non-simultaneous* (as urged in Sū 6) For the non simultaneity of apprehensions having been found impossible, by reason of the absence of *movement* in the *all pervading* Mind, there is no other reason from which it could be inferred (by which it could be accounted for) *In the case of the Organ of Vision, though the fact of near and remote things (e g Hand and Moon respectively) being seen at the same time leads one to conclude that the Organ has no movement, yet the fact that it *has* movement is inferred from the reason in the shape of the phenomenon of obstruction of vision by the interposition of something else, between the Eye and the Hand (which is near), and between the Eye and the Moon (which is remote) [There is however no such reason or ground available for the inferring of movement in the Mind, in which movement is found to be apparently impossible by reason of its all-pervading character, according to the Opponent]

All this dispute does not arise in regard to the *existence* of the Internal Organ (Mind), nor in regard to its *eternality*, for that there *is* such an Internal Organ as the Mind and that it is eternal, are well-established facts † "In regard to what, then, does the dispute arise?" it arises in regard to its all pervading character, and this character is denied (by the *Siddhāntin*) on the ground that *there is no proof for it* [lit, it is not found to be cognised by any instrument of right cognition].

[The *Bhāṣya* proceeds to show a further reason for rejecting the view that the Emanations, Cognitions, and their Source, *Buddhi*, are identical]—The internal Organ is *one*, while the Emanations, in the shape of Cognitions, are *many*; e g, visual cognition, olfactory cognition, cognition of Colour, cognition of

* The Author cites an example *per contra* —*Bhāṣyacandra*.

† The *Narāyaṇa* also admits the Mind to be atomic and hence eternal. It is only *Buddhi*, Cognition, that he holds to be transient

Odour ; all this would be impossible if the Emanations and their source were identical.

From all this we conclude that it is the (Conscious) Person that cognises, and not the Internal Organ *

By this fact (that it is the Person that knows, and not the Internal Organ)† what has been said by the Sāṅkhya in regard to the Mind being 'occupied with other things' becomes refuted, because 'being occupied with other things' can only mean 'apprehending other things', and this belongs to the Person, not to the Internal Organ, § though we do admit of the Mind also being 'occupied', in the sense that in one case it is in contact with a Sense-organ, while in another it is not in such contact [But this does not justify the view that the apprehending is done by *Buddhi*, and not by the Person]

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The Opponent, the *Sāṅkhya*, says]—"Even when the 'Emanation' is identical with its Source, it cannot be (reasonably) asserted that 'the Internal Organ is one, and its Emanations many'. Because]

Sūtra 9

"the notion of its being different (diverse) is analogous to the notion of difference (diversity) in regard to the rock-crystal "

BHĀṢYA

"In regard to the Emanation (which, as identical with the Internal Organ, is, in reality, one only), there is a notion of its

* For the *Siddhāntin*, who regards the Emanations as different from their source, it is quite possible and reasonable that things are cognised by the Soul, by the instrumentality of such instruments as the Internal Organ and the several Sense-organs—*Tātparyā*

† Or the fact that the Internal Organ is not all pervading—according to the *Bhāṣyatandāra*

§ He alone can be 'pre-occupied' who apprehends things, and inasmuch as it is the Person, and not the Internal Organ, that apprehends, it is only the person that can be said to be 'occupied by other things'. This however does not mean that no kind of 'occupation' is possible for the Internal Organ, 'occupation' in the sense of being in contact with the Sense-organs is quite possible for the Internal Organ, it is only 'occupation' in the sense of 'apprehending things' that cannot belong to it

being many (diverse), by reason of its being associated, or in contact, with diverse objects —just in the same manner as, in regard to the rock-crystal, which is in contact with other (coloured) substances, there is the notion of its being different (from the pure white rock crystal),—when the crystal is spoken of as being 'blue' or 'red' (as distinguished from the white crystal) ""

[The *Bhāṣya* answers the above view of the *Sāṅkhya*—*We cannot accept the above, as there is no reason in support of it* † What the Opponent means is that—"the notion of diversity in regard to Cognitions is only figurative, unreal, being like the notion of diversity in regard to the rock crystal, and it is not real, as is the notion of diversity in regard to Odour, Taste, etc."—but in support of this theory there is no reason adduced [what is stated in Su 9 being only an Example], and in the absence of valid reasons, it cannot be accepted as right. "But the absence of reasons is equal" § Certainly not, for as a matter of fact, in the case of Cognition* it is actually found that they appear and dis-

* The phrase '*viśvaṅmanopadhāna*' at the end of the paragraph is to be construed with *nimittābhamanah* of the second line the construction being—*तस्या प्रज्ञा नानात्वाभिमानो विषयान्तरोपधानाद्, यथाद्वयान्तरोपहित* . . . नीलो लोहित इति ।

The sense of the *Pūrva-pakṣa* is thus explained by the *Tatparjya* —'It is true that Emanations appear as many, but this appearance is a mistaken one, for it is not possible for the Emanations, which are not different from the Internal Organ, to be many in reality. The fact of the matter is that, just as in the case of the Rock-crystal which is one and of one uniform colour, notions of diversity appear by reason of its contact with several coloured things, and this notion of diversity is purely adventitious—in the same manner when the pure white Internal Organ becomes associated, through the Sense-organs, with diverse things, it takes the form of the Cognitions or 'Emanations,' and hence appears as diverse and many.'

† This is found as *Sūtra* in Pūrva 60 Ma, in *Sūtra* Ma D also in *Nyāyamantratīkārāṇa* the *Bhāṣyotandra* and *Vaiśvanātha* also treat it as *Sūtra*. But it is not found in the *Nyāyatutimbādhā*, and both the *Vārtika* and the *Tatparjya* take it as part of the *Bhāṣya*. *Vardhamāna* says that some people call it '*Siddhānta-Sūtra*', and adds that the *Tatparjya* calls it '*Bhāṣyam*', because the '*bhāṣya*' is nothing more than an explanation and expansion of the '*Sūtra*'.

§ 'Just as we make the simple assertion—that the notion of diversity is figurative—without adducing any reasons—so do you also merely make the assertion that the notion of diversity is real, without adducing any reasons. So that both of us are open to the same charge.'

appear one after the other [and not all together,—and this is a clear reason in support of the proposition that they are really many, not one] That is, it is found as a matter of fact that in connection with the Object of Perception, Cognitions appear and disappear, one after the other (at different points of time), and from this it follows that the notion of diversity in regard to Cognitions is real, just as it is in regard to Odour, etc

SECTION (2)

(Sūtras 10-17)

Examination of the Theory that Things of the World are in Perpetual flux undergoing destruction every moment

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Under Su 9, the Sāṅkhya has asserted that—"The notion of diversity in regard to the Emanation is analogous to the notion of diversity in regard to the rock-crystal",—being unable to admit this, the Nihilist [who holds that things of the world are in a perpetual flux, undergoing destruction every moment] argues as follows *—

* Having thus refuted the Sankhya doctrine from the standpoint of the Nyaya the Author, with a view to point out the defects in that doctrine pointed out by the Bauddha philosophers proceeds first, to expound the doctrine of the Bauddhas —*Tatparya*

Though the main subject matter of this section—the demolition of the Nihilistic philosophy—is of use in all philosophical systems, yet in the present context it has been introduced with a view to the proving of the Soul's existence, it is only when the continued existence of things has been established that there can be any force in the arguments based upon Recognition that have been put forward under Su 3 1 1 *et seq* and it is only when the difference between qualities and things possessed of qualities has been established that we can prove the existence of the Soul, as the necessary substratum of such well known qualities as Desire and the rest—*Paribuddhi*

Some people have held that this is only a part and continuation of the foregoing section, and should not be treated as a separate section, specially because the Bhāṣya at the end of the present section concludes with the words— Thus it is proved that Buddha is not-eternal, from which it is clear that the Bhāṣya takes the whole as one section dealing with the *non-eternality of Buddha*. But the fact of the matter is that the subject matter of the present section is totally different the Bhāṣya conclusion is due to the fact that the subject of the present section has been introduced in connection with the *non-eternality of Buddha*.—*Verdhamāna*

by an entirely different entity, without any trace of the former, —and each of these entities has but a momentary existence ,”—but this view

Sūtra 12

can not be accepted , because the cause of production and of destruction (when present) are perceived

BHĀṢYA

The augmentation of component particles is perceived to be the 'cause of production', in the case, for instance, of the *Ant-hill* and such other things, and the disruption of component particles is perceived to be the 'cause of destruction' in the case, for instance, of the *Jar* and such other things. But when a philosopher holds that a thing is *destroyed*, without losing any of its component particles, or that a thing is *produced*, without having its component particles augmented,—there can *not* be perceived any cause, either of the 'total destruction' or of the 'production' of an entirely new thing *

Sūtra 13

[The *Nihilist* says—]

"Just as in the case of the destruction of milk, and the production of curd, the cause is not perceived [and is yet admitted],—so would it be in the case of the substances in question "

BHĀṢYA

"[When milk is turned into curd] though we do not perceive the cause either of the destruction of the milk, or of the production of the curd, yet the existence of such cause is admitted,—similarly in the case of the *Rock-crystal*, the existence of the cause of destruction, as also of the production, of several individual entities should be admitted."

Sūtra 14

[The *Siddhānta* answers—]

Inasmuch as there is actual apprehension through indicatives, there is no non perception (in the case of milk and curd)

* The *Vārtika* explains the argument somewhat differently.

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, the cause of the destruction of Milk is actually apprehended—being indicated by the destruction of the Milk, similarly the cause of the production of Curd is also apprehended,—being indicated by the production of the Curd, so that it is not true that there is 'non perception' (of the said causes)* Contrary to this is the case of such substances as the Rock crystal and the like, for in the case of these, there is nothing to indicate the production of several individual entities (in the same object), which leads us to conclude that there is no such production (of several entities in a piece of Rock-crystal)

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

To what the Bauddha Nihilist has urged in Su 13 some one (the *Saṅkhya*) has offered the following answer—

Sutra 15

'Of the milk there is no destruction (when it turns into curd), for what happens is either transformation or manifestation of new qualities' †

BHĀṢYA

Of the milk there is *transformation* not *destruction*, —says one (the *Saṅkhya*)— and there is *transformation* when the substance remaining constant its former character (e g that of

* That there is destruction of the Milk is inferred from the appearance of Curd in the milk particles the inference being— In the milk particles there has been *destruction of Milk* because there have appeared in them particles of a substance other than not compatible with Milk and the *destruction of Milk* being thus cognised inasmuch as the said *destruction* is an effect it must have a *cause* so that the *cause of destruction* is indicated by has for its indicative the *destruction*. The indicative of the *production of Curd* consists in the actual *perception of the Curd* and when the *production* is thus cognised inasmuch as it is an effect it must have a *cause* so that the *cause of the production of Curd* is indicated by its *production*. And it is not true that the *cause of the destruction of Milk* and that of *production of Curd* are not perceived (as urged by the Opponent in Cū 13)
—*Bhāṣyaśāstra*

† The translation of the *Sutra* is in accordance with the interpretation of the *Bhāṣya* the *Lārīkā* and the *Bhāṣyaśāstra*. According to Viśvanātha it should run thus— *What happens is only transformation which consists in the manifestation of new qualities*

'milk') is destroyed and a new character (e.g. that of 'curd') is produced."

Another philosopher (the Neo Sankhya) says that "there is manifestation of new qualities i.e. the substance remaining constant, its former qualities disappear and new ones appear" *

Both these views appear as if they were one and the same

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The answer to both the views (put forward in Su 15) is as follows —

Sūtra 16

[*Siddhānta*].—When we perceive a new Substance being produced through a fresh reconstitution, we infer from this the cessation (destruction) of the previous substance

BHĀṢYA

When we see that a new Substance, in the shape of *Curd*, is produced through a fresh reconstitution or reorganisation of the component particles,—this re-constitution being in the form of *coagulation*,†—we infer from this that the previous substance, *Milk*, has been 'destroyed' through the disruption of its component particles, just as when we see the new substance—*Saucer*—being produced out of a fresh re-arrangement of the component particles of the *Clay-lump*, it is inferred that the *Clay-lump* has been 'destroyed' through the disruption of its component particles. And the constitutional contiguity between *Milk* and *Curd* is similar to that between *Clay* and things made of *Clay*, [that is, the component particles of the *Milk* continue to subsist in the *Curd*, just as those of *Clay* do in the thing made of *Clay*]; if there were a complete destruction of the *Milk* (along with its component particles,—if it were completely burnt to ashes, for instance),—the production of the new substance (*Curd*) would

* The new qualities also are not *produced* in the sense that they come into existence for the first time for according to the Sankhya the qualities were there all along, but only in a latent form, and they only become manifested, and when they are regarded as having been destroyed, they only disappear from view they are not lost

† When the former constitution or arrangement of the component particles of the former substance—*Milk*—is upset and a fresh arrangement—conducive to the new substance—is set in, we have what is called '*samutthānam*'—*Bhāṣya*

never be possible,—there being no connection possible (between this production and any existing substance)

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Even admitting (for the sake of argument) that there is destruction of Milk and production of Curd without any cause, we point out the following objections against the theory (of the Nihilist) —

Sūtra 17

Inasmuch as in some cases the cause of destruction is perceived while in some it is not perceived,—what is stated (as the premiss) is not universally true *

BHĀṢYA

It is not universally true that—"there is destruction and production of individual rock crystals, just as there is of Milk and Curd —' Why? '—Because there is no reason (in support of such a universal proposition), that is, there is no ground for asserting that "the case of the individual entities in the Rock crystal is analogous to that of Milk and Curd, where destruction and production are without cause,—and it is *not* analogous to that of the Jar, where there is destruction when the cause of destruction is present, so that there is no destruction and production of individual entities in the Rock-crystal simply because the causes of such destruction and production are not present ' †

Further, the statement of the Example is baseless. If 'destruction and production' were ever actually perceived in the case of such things as the Rock crystal and the like, then alone could there be any basis for the statement of the Example—'just as in the case of the destruction of Milk and the production of Curd the cause is not perceived (Su 13),—as a matter of fact however 'destruction and production' are not

* Viśvanātha reads the Sūtra simply as अचिद्विनाशकारणानुपलब्धे. But everywhere else—in the *Nyāyasūtratīkā* and *Nyāyasūtrabandha* the Sūtra—Ms. D and in Furi Sū. Ms.—we find it as printed in the *Viz* Text.

† The reading of the last part of the passage is confused, by a comparison of the readings in several manuscripts the right reading appears to be—कुम्भस्य विनाश उत्पत्तिकारणभावाच्चोत्पत्ति एव स्पष्टादिव्यक्त्या विनाशोत्पत्तिकारणभावाद्विनाशोत्पत्त्यभाव इति ।

perceived (in things like the Rock crystal),—hence the statement of the Example is entirely baseless *

Then again, when you admit the 'destruction and production' of the Rock-crystal, you tacitly admit also the cause of these [since, being effects, they must have a cause], so that your denial (of the cause) is not right. That is to say, you cannot but admit the force of the Example (of the Jar) in the assertion—'the destruction and production of the Rock-crystal, etc., like those of the Jar, cannot be without cause', for the simple reason that its force cannot be denied. On the other hand, the force of the Example cited by you—in the assertion "the destruction and production of the Rock-crystal, like those of Milk and Curd, are without cause"—can be easily denied, for the simple reason that (in all cases) 'destruction and production' are actually found to proceed from causes, so that when we see 'destruction and production' in the case of Milk and Curd, we infer the presence of a cause, as the Effect is a sure indicative of the Cause.

From all that has gone before (in this section and the last) it follows that *Buddhi* or Apprehension is *not eternal*

SECTION 3

Sūtras 18—41

Buddhi is a quality of the Soul

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

We now proceed to consider the question—From among the Soul, the Sense organs, and the Objects of Cognition, of which one is *Buddhi* the quality?† Though this fact is well

* A correct example is that which is found to be similar to the thing in question, in the present instance 'destruction and production of several entities in the Rock crystal' is the thing in question, under dispute, so that the Example to be correct should be one that resembles the said 'destruction and production'—this resemblance could be known to us only if we had ever perceived such 'destruction and production in the Rock crystal' [Until we have perceived a thing we cannot recognise its resemblance to anything] As a matter of fact however, no such 'production and destruction in the Rock-crystal' is ever perceived. Hence the example cannot be a correct one.—*Tatparya*

† It is only after the eternality of *Buddhi* has been refuted that there is any likelihood of its being a quality of the Soul. Hence it is the latter

known, yet it is introduced with a view to carry on further investigations on the subject. The doubt as regards Apprehension (being the quality of the Soul or of some other Substance) arises from the fact that it is found to arise from the contact (of several things, Soul, Mind, Sense-organ and Object), and people fail to detect any peculiarity in any one of these (by virtue of which the quality of Apprehension could be attributed to that one exclusively)

Sūtra 18

Apprehension (Buddhi's) cannot subsist in the Sense-organ, or in the Object,—since it continues to exist also when these two have been destroyed

BHĀṢYA

Apprehension or Cognition cannot be a quality of either the Sense organ or the Object, because even when these have ceased to exist, Apprehension continues to exist. For instance even after the object (seen) and the Sense-organ (the Eye) have been destroyed we have the Cognition in the form 'I have seen'. On the other hand, after the Cogniser (the Soul) has been destroyed, there can be no Cognition at all. As a matter of fact,

subject that is introduced now. The purpose of this enquiry also consists in the proving of the Soul as an entity apart from the Body etc. Under Sū 3 1 1 *et seq* we have proved the existence of the Soul on the strength of Apprehension through Recognition, and now we are going to establish it on the strength of Apprehension as its quality —*Parissuddhi*.

Vardhamana adds the following —The connection of the present Section with the immediately preceding section on the momentary character of things lies in this that if all things are momentary, there can be no such thing as the 'constituent' cause of things, so that there would be no possibility of Apprehension subsisting, as quality, in the Soul. Hence before taking up this latter question we have had to dispose of the former theory.

Even though the fact of Apprehension being a quality of the Soul has already been put forward under Sū 3 1 14, yet there is this difference that under that *Sūtra* we have proved the existence of the Soul, as the substratum of Apprehension as a quality, while now we are going to prove the existence of Apprehension itself as a quality of the Soul. Some people think that the present section serves the purpose of adding fresh reasonings in support of the doctrine already established before, and thus strengthening the pupil's convictions. The *Tatparya*, for instance, remarks that the present section carries on further investigation into a matter already discussed before.

there are two kinds of Cognition there is one kind of Cognition which proceeds from the contact of the Sense-organ and the Object (e.g. the ordinary perceptive cognitions), and which ceases upon the destruction of the Sense-organ and the Object; and there is the other kind of Cognition which proceeds from the Contact of the Mind and the Soul, and it is only natural that these latter should persist (even upon the destruction of the Sense-organ and the Object). To this latter class belongs the recollection in the form 'I have seen', which pertains to things seen before, and when the Cogniser has been destroyed, it is not possible for any previous perception to be recollected, for a thing that has been perceived by one cannot be recollected by another. Even if the existence of Soul be not admitted, and the Mind be regarded as the *Cogniser*,—it would not be possible to prove that either the Sense-organ or the Object is the *Cogniser*.

"Well then, Cognition may be a quality of the Mind "

[The answer to this is given in the next *Sūtra*]

Sūtra 19

Apprehension cannot be the quality of the Mind, (a) whose existence is inferred from the fact that the apprehension of things is not simultaneous—[or (b), because the apprehension of things is not simultaneous]—[(c) and also because the simultaneous cognition of things actually appearing in Mystics would be inexplicable if Cognition belonged to the Mind]*

BHĀṢYA

(A) The fact that the Apprehension of things is not simultaneous is indicative of the existence of the Internal Organ (Mind) [as explained in *Sū* 1-1-16], and the Internal Organ (or Mind), having its existence inferred from the fact that the apprehension of things is not simultaneous,—Apprehension or Cognition cannot be a quality of that Mind

"Of what then is it a quality?"

* Two explanations of the term *युगपज्ज्ञेयानुपलब्धे* are possible; both of which have been incorporated in the translation as (a) and (b). The *Bhāṣya* construes the च in the *Sūtra* as implying a further reason, which we put in as (c). The *Bhāṣya* notices only (a) and (b).

all pervading (not *atomic*), even so this could not be accepted as a valid argument against Apprehension being a quality of the Soul For if Mind were all pervading, then, since it is the internal Organ (of Cognition), (and is all pervading), it could be in contact with all the sense organs at one and the same time, and thus bring about several Cognitions at one and the same time (even in the case of ordinary persons) (which is an impossibility)

Sutra 20

[*Objection*].—"What has been urged applies equally to the case of Apprehension being a Quality of the Soul "

BHĀṢYA

' The Soul being all-pervading, would be in contact with all the Sense-organs at one and the same time so that there would be a possibility of several Cognitions appearing simultaneously '

Sutra 21

[*Answer*].—The said (simultaneous) appearance of Cognitions is not possible because the contact of the Mind with (all) the Sense organs is not possible

BHĀṢYA

In the cognition of Odour, etc , the contact of the Sense-organs with the Mind is as much a necessary cause as the contact of the Sense-organs with the objects and inasmuch as the Mind is *atomic*, it is not possible for its contact with all the Sense-organs to appear at one and the same time And by reason of the non-simultaneity of this contact (of the Mind), it is not possible for several cognitions to appear simultaneously, even though they are the qualities of the (all pervading) Soul

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

If it be held that—' The Cognition of Odour etc , proceeds from the contact among Soul, Sense-organ and Object only, and the contact of Mind is not essential , [so that even though the contact of the Mind and the Sense-organ may be absent, that will not stand in the way of Cognitions appearing simultaneously, hence there is no force in the answer given in Su 21]"—then our answer is—

Sūtra 22

This can not be right ; for no proof is adduced in support of such origin (of Cognitions, without contact of Mind).*

BHĀṢYA

When you make the assertion that—"The Cognition of Odour etc., proceeds from contact among Soul, Sense-organ and Object only",—you do not adduce any proof in support of such origin,—on the strength whereof we could accept it †

Sūtra 23

[*Objection*]—"Further, if Apprehension subsists (in the Soul), then it should have to be regarded as eternal ; since we do not perceive any cause for its destruction "

BHĀṢYA

"What is urged in this Sūtra is meant to be taken along with what has been said under Sū 20 [This² is the sense of the particle *ca*]

"There are two kinds of causes whereby qualities are destroyed: (1) the destruction of the substance in which the quality subsists, and (2) the appearance of a contrary quality Inasmuch as the Soul (which is the substance in which Apprehension subsists) is eternal, the former cause of destruction is not possible (in the destruction of Apprehension) Then, as for a quality contrary to Apprehension (whose appearance would put an end to the Apprehension), we do not find any such quality (appearing in the Soul) So that, if Apprehension is the quality of Soul, it must have to be regarded as eternal "

Sūtra 24

[*Answer*]—Inasmuch as Apprehension is (universally) recognised as non-eternal, its destruction proceeds from another apprehension ; just like Sound

* 'Kāraṇa' stands for 'pramāṇa', proofs, says the *Bhāṭyacandra*, What the Opponent says in Sū 21 is a mere assertion and since no proofs have been adduced in support thereof it cannot be accepted

† Viśvanātha takes this Sūtra also as coming from the *Pūrtapakṣin* and meaning as follows —"Inasmuch as the Siddhāntin cannot point out the cause of Cognition, Cognition cannot belong to the Soul He cannot point to *Mind Soul Contact* as the cause ; for if this were so, then Cognition should never cease, the contact of the all-pervading Soul being always present "

BHĀṢYA

That Apprehension is transient is recognised by all living beings in their own experience,—and as a matter of fact, (in the case of every Apprehension) we perceive a series of cognitions, and we infer from these facts that (in this series) one Apprehension is 'contrary' to the other,—just as in every Sound there is a series of Sounds, where one Sound is contrary to the other [and hence the cause of its destruction]

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[Says the Opponent]—"If Apprehension is a quality of the Soul, several Recollections should appear at one and the same time, for innumerable impressions produced by cognitions—which are the causes of Recollections subsist in the Soul simultaneously,—and the contact of the Mind with the Soul, which is a cause common to all Recollections, is also present, so that there is no *non-simultaneity* in the causes of Recollections [Hence it should be possible to have several Recollections at one and the same time]'

In view of this objection, some Logicians (*Ēkadeśins*), with a view to show that the contact (necessary for Recollections) is *not* simultaneous, offer the following explanation —

Sūtra 25

"As a matter of fact, Recollection proceeds from the contact of the Mind with that part of the Soul which is permeated by (the impression of) the (corresponding) Cognition, so that several Recollections cannot appear simultaneously"

BHĀṢYA

'The term '*Jñāna*' in the *Sūtra* stands for *impression brought about by cognition*. What happens (in cases of Recollection) is that the Mind comes into contact only gradually, one after the other, with such parts of the Soul as are impressed (affected) by Cognition, 'hence the Recollections also, that proceed from the said contact of the Mind with the Soul, appear only gradually, one after the other (and *not* simultaneously)'

Sūtra 26

This explanation is not right, because the Mind lies within the Body

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, when the Mind of man comes into contact with the Soul born in a body,—and this contact appears along with such Karmic residue as has begun to bear fruit,—this is what is called the person's 'living', so that until the person dies (and the Soul escapes from the limitations of the Body), it is not possible for the Mind,—which lies and functions within the Body,—to come into contact with such parts of the Soul as lie outside of the Body, and to be impressed by (previous) cognitions [And as for those parts of the Soul that lie within the Body, with these the Mind is in contact at one and the same time, whereby the possibility of Cognition and Recollections appearing simultaneously remains]

Sūtra 27

[*The Ekadeśin objects to Sū 26*].—"The reason put forward is not valid, because it is still to be proved."

BHĀṢYA

"As a matter of fact, *living* consists in *fructifying Karmic residue* only, so that it is still to be proved that *the Mind lies within the Body* "

Sūtra 28

[*Answer*].—The above objection is not right because (in support of our contention) there is this proof that the recollecting person retains a body

BHĀṢYA

When a person is desirous of recollecting something, he concentrates his mind, and then, after some time, succeeds in recollecting that thing, and while he is recollecting it, he is found to be equipped with the Body [which shows that in the phenomenon of Recollecting the Mind operates in the Body, otherwise, if the Mind operated outside the Body, there would be no contact of the Mind outside with the Soul as equipped with the Body, and in the absence of this contact, no Effort would be possible, and without such Effort the *retaining of the Body* would be impossible] The Effort due to the contact of the Mind with the Soul is of two kinds—*retaining* and *impelling*, and when the Mind goes out of the Body, no *retaining Effort* (within the

Body) would be possible, so that (in the absence of the *retaining* or *sustaining Effort*), the Body of the recollecting person would, through its inherent gravity, fall down

Sūtra 29

[*Another Objection*]"What has been urged is not possible, as the Mind is quick in its movement "

BHĀṢYA

"As a matter of fact, the Mind is quick in moving, so that it is quite possible for it to go out of the Body and come into contact with such parts of the Soul as are outside the Body, and are impressed by Cognition, and then it quickly returns within the Body, and gives rise to the Effort-(necessary for the retaining of the Body) Thus it is quite possible for the Mind to carry on both the processes of *Contact* and of *Effort*) Or (inversely), it may be that the Mind goes out of the Body after having produced the Effort required for the retaining of the Body, and thus it is quite possible that the Body should continue to be retained (until the Mind returns to it, which it does very quickly)

Sūtra 30

[*Answer*]"What has been asserted is not possible, because there is no restriction as to the time of Recollection

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, while one thing is remembered quickly, in another the process of recollection is delayed, and when the process of recollection is delayed, the Mind is held concentrated, with a desire to remember the thing, and there appears a continuous series of ideas, and when among these there appears the idea of some such thing as happens to be the distinguishing feature of the thing to be remembered, it becomes the direct cause of the desired recollection. All this phenomenon could not be possible, (under the theory of the Opponent), as it would mean the going out of the Mind for a considerable length of time

Then again, the contact of the Mind with the Soul cannot bring about Recollection, except when it is in contact with the Body, because it is the Body that forms the receptacle of all experience. As a matter of fact, it is the Body of the Cognitive Person which forms the receptacle of experience, so that when

the Mind goes out of the Body, its mere contact with the Soul cannot bring about either Cognition, or Pleasure etc., if it did (i.e. if Cognition, Pleasure etc. were brought about independently of the Body) then there would be no use of the Body at all

Sūtra 31

[A second Ekadeśin Logician offers the following remarks against the view of the former Ekadeśin propounded in Sū 25]—
 “The particular kind of contact (of the Mind, with things outside the Body) is not possible, (a) either by the impelling of the Soul or (b) by chance, or (c) by reason of intelligence’

BHĀṢYA

The contact of the Mind outside the body could be due—(a) either to the impelling of the Soul or (b) to chance, or (c) to the intelligence of the Mind—but as a matter of fact, none of these is possible “Why?” (a) Because the thing has still got to be recollected, and because Recollection and Cognition are not possible through mere desire. That is to say, if the said contact were due to the impelling or urging by the Soul, then it would mean that the Soul impells the Mind after having cogitated thus—‘the Impression which is the cause of the Recollection of this particular thing subsists in this part of the Soul, let therefore the Mind come into contact with this part’;—and this form of cogitation (where the idea of the thing is already present) on the part of the Soul would mean that the thing is *already recollected* and is not one *that has got to be recollected*, and further, ‘a part of the Soul’ or the ‘Impression’ cannot be perceptible to the Soul, so that any apprehension of these by the cognition of the Soul itself is absolutely impossible [and yet both of these appear in the said cogitation] (b) As a matter of fact, the person recollects a thing only after fixing his mind upon it for some time, and it (i.e., the contact necessary for Recollection) cannot be due to mere *Chance*. (c) Lastly, *intelligence* (to which the said contact might be due) does not belong to the Mind at all, as we have already shown that Consciousness does not belong to it

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The said particular kind of contact (which has been objected to under Sū 31)—

Sūtra 32

is similar to that particular kind of contact which causes pain in the foot of the person whose Mind is preoccupied.

BHĀṢYA

When a person, having his Mind preoccupied with some attractive scene,* is hurt in the foot by a pebble or thorn, a particular kind of contact of the Mind with the Soul must be admitted, for we perceive that there is actual pain and feeling of pain in such cases, and what has been urged (in Su 31, against the particular kind of contact postulated by the previous *Ekadeśin* in the case of Recollection) would apply with equal force to the case cited [And yet it cannot be denied that there is such contact actually present in the case] Then as regards what the second *Ekadeśin* has said in regard to contact being due to 'chance' (in Su 31),—it is open to this additional objection that as a matter of fact, no action and no contact can ever be due to mere 'chance' [So that this part of the argument is entirely baseless]

"But in the case of the pain caused by the thorn, what causes the action (in the Mind) is the Unseen Karma (force of Destiny) which brings about all experience "

This also will be equally applicable to both cases. What you mean is that—"the Unseen Destiny, subsisting in the Person, which serves to bring about all his experiences, is what leads to the action of the Mind (and brings it into contact with the Soul), whereby there comes about pain and also the feeling of pain",—but exactly the same may be the case also with the particular kind of contact that brings about Recollection

Thus then, what has been said by the second *Ekadeśin*, to the effect that "the particular kind of contact is not possible, either by the impelling of the Soul, or by chance, or by intelligence" (Su 32)—is no criticism at all (of what the first *Ekadeśin* has put forward under Sū 25), the real criticism of that position is what has been said by us above to the effect

* Several Mss. read देशे, which should be construed with what follows, meaning—"having his foot hurt by a pebble or thorn in some place". But दृश्ये gives better sense, as translated.

that 'this explanation is not right, because the Mind lies within the Body' Su. (26)

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Question—"What now is the reason that Recollections are not simultaneous, even though their causes are present at one and the same time?"

Sūtra 33

[**Answer**]—Recollections are not simultaneous, because such causes as Attention Perception of the Sign and the rest are not all present at one and the same time.

BHĀṢYA

Just as the *Contact of the Soul with the Mind and Impressions* are the 'cause of Recollection', so also are Attention and Perception of the Sign and such other things [detailed in Su 41], and inasmuch as these latter do not appear at one and the same time, it is to this that the non-simultaneity of Recollections is due *

[The Opponent argues]—"Just as in the case of Intuition Perception, so also in the case of such Recollection as is independent of Attention and the other causes, there should be simultaneity That is, there are at times certain Recollections which, being independent of Attention and the other causes, resemble Intuition Perception, and in such Recollections there should be simultaneity, as there is no reason (why there should be no simultaneity)"†

[**Answer**]—As a matter of fact in the case cited also, the several causes are present and it is because these causes fail to be perceived that people have the idea that the Recollection resembles Intuition Perception What actually happens is that, when there appear in the Mind a number of ideas pertaining

* Mind-Soul Contact and Impressions are not the sole cause of Recollection So that even though these two are present yet inasmuch as the other causes of Recollection—Attention etc.—are not present several Recollections do not appear simultaneously

† When for instance, without any rhyme or reason a recollection rushes in upon the Mind all on a sudden *Pratibhavat etc* is printed in some editions as Sūtra But no such Sūtra appears either in the *Nyāya-sūtrabandha* or in any of the Sūtra Mss or in *Viśvanātha's Vyā*

to several things, it is only some one of these several things that brings about Recollection in some man (and not in others), and this is so because he recollects that particular thing because he ponders more specially over that thing, and yet the Recollector is not cognisant of all the causes that go to bring about the Recollection, he does not review his entire memory-process by thinking that 'in this fashion has my Recollection come about', and because he is not cognisant of the causes, he thinks that his Recollection resembles Intuitional Perception, and also that Recollection is not dependent upon *Attention* and such other causes

Question—"How is it in the case of Intuitional Perception?"*

Answer—The restriction or limitation is due to the peculiarities of the person's *Karma* (past deeds) just as there is in the case of experience. What the question means is—"Why does not Intuitional Perception appear simultaneously?"—and the meaning of the answer is that—just as the Man's past *Karma*, which brings about his experiences, does not bring about all his experiences at one and the same time,—similarly the peculiarity of man's past *Karma* which is the cause of his Intuitional Perception, does not bring about several such perceptions at one and the same time †

"What is said can not be right because there is no reason "

This objection is not right, because an Instrument has power to bring about cognitions only one by one. That is to say, if, by your objection, you mean that—"When you say that the limitation is similar to that in the case of experiences, what you put forward is only an example,—you do not put forward any reason",—then our answer is that this objection has no force, because as a matter of fact, an Instrument can, by its very nature, bring about cognitions only one by one, and several cognitions are never produced, at one and the same time, either with regard to one or with regard to several objects,—and from this perceived fact of cognitions appearing one by one,

* This question has been propounded by the Author by way of introduction to the principal argument in support of his theory—*Tatparya*

† The *Tatparya* calls this answer '*adilam*' unsatisfactory. The real answer comes in the next passage

Sūtra 34

Inasmuch as activity and cessation from activity are caused by Desire and Aversion of a Cognisant Being [Desire and Aversion must belong to this Cognisant Being] *

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, what happens is that the person *cognises* the fact of a certain thing being a source of pleasure and another thing being a source of pain to him,—then he *desires* to obtain that which gives him pleasure and *desires* to get rid of what causes him pain,—and when he is imbued with the *desire to obtain* and puts forth an Effort to obtain what gives him pleasure, this *Effort* is what is called 'activity', and when imbued with the desire to get rid of a thing, he avoids what gives him pain, this is what constitutes 'cessation from activity'—thus we find that *Cognising Desiring Effort, Aversion, Pleasure, and Pain*, all these belong to (subsist in) one and the same substratum, that is, *Cognising, Desiring and Acting* have one and the same Agent, and subsist in the same substratum. From all this it follows that Desire, Aversion, Effort Pleasure, and Pain are properties of the cognisant, intelligent thing (the Soul)—and not of a non intelligent thing (the Internal Organ). Such 'activity' and 'cessation from activity' as have been described we actually perceive in the case of our own Souls,—and from this we infer the same in regard to other Souls.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The philosopher who holds Intelligence to belong to Material Substances (i.e., the Materialist) says—

Sūtra 35

"Inasmuch as the said Activity and Absence of Activity are the sole indicatives of Desire and Aversion, these cannot

other hand are by their very nature diverse and liable to be produced and destroyed. Hence while the Cognition belongs to the Soul Desire etc. belong to the Internal Organ.

* Viṣṇanātha has supplied two constructions of the Sūtra—(1) Activity and Cessation from Activity are due to Desire and Aversion hence these latter are *हेतवः*, must belong to a Cognisant Being* and (2) Inasmuch as Activity and Cessation from Activity are caused by Desire and Aversion of a Cognisant Being (these latter must belong to that cognisant being)

be denied in regard to the Bodies composed of Earth and other material substances "

BHĀṢYA

"The presence of Desire and Aversion is indicated by Activity and Absence of Activity, hence it follows that Desire and Aversion must belong to that to which Activity and Cessation from Activity belong, and to that same should belong Cognition also,—so that, inasmuch as Activity and Absence of Activity are found in Bodies composed of Earth, Water, Fire and Air,—it is these Bodies that are endowed with Desire, Aversion, and Cognition which shows that Intelligence belongs to these material bodies "

Sūtra 36

Since we find Activity and Absence of Activity in such things as the Axe and the like,—

BHĀṢYA

it follows that Intelligence need not belong to the material Body That is, if the finding of Activity and Absence of Activity in a certain thing justifies the attributing of Desire, Aversion and Cognition to it—then, inasmuch as such Activity and Absence of Activity are found also in such *Instruments* as the Axe and the like, Intelligence should be attributed to these also Desire etc., are attributed to the Body,—and yet we find, in the case of the Axe etc., that Activity and Cessation from Activity are not concomitant with Desire etc.,—so that it cannot be right reasoning to argue that—'*because Activity and Absence of Activity are found in Bodies of Earth, Water, Fire and Air,*—therefore, Desire, Aversion and Cognition must belong to these "

[Says the *Materialist*].—"Well, in that case, we shall put another meaning to the words—'*tallīgatvat* etc., etc.,' (Su 35) The 'activity' of the material substances, Earth etc., in bodies,—transitory* (of insects) and durable (of animals and men),—consists of a particular kind of action, whose presence is indicated by the aggregation or re arrangement of the component parti-

* We adopt the reading तल्लु for ताल्ल, It is found in several Mss and is supported by the *Tatparya* which says—'तल्लसु' अस्थिरेषु कृमिप्रभृतानां शरीरेषु, 'स्यावरेषु' स्थिरेषु देवमनुष्यादीनां शरीरेषु

cles of those bodies (by virtue of which the shape of the bodies undergoes changes, becoming fatter or leaner etc.), 'Absence of Activity'—i.e., Inactivity—is found in such things as stone etc., in which there is no such indication of activity,—and again, the presence of Desire and Aversion is indicated by 'Activity' and 'Absence of Activity',—so that, inasmuch as we find Activity and Absence of Activity in the Atoms of Earth etc., (as shown above), and as Desire and Aversion are concomitant with these (Activity and Absence of Activity), it follows that Cognition also belongs to those same Atoms,—and thus it becomes established that Intelligence belongs to material substances (and not to the Soul)'

[Our answer to the above is as follows]—What has been put forward is not a valid reason, as it is not perceived in such things as the Jar and the like*. In the case of the Earth-molecules composing the Jar and such things also we find 'activity' in the form of a particular action which is indicated by *aggregation* or *re arrangement* (of parts),—and we find 'absence of activity' in such things as the Sound (in which case there is no aggregation) in which every form of action is absent,—and yet even though 'Activity and Absence of Activity' are found in the Earth molecules and Sound, we do not find in them 'Desire and Aversion',—from this it is clear that mere presence of 'Activity and Absence of Activity' in anything cannot be a valid ground for attributing to it Desire and Aversion

Sūtra 37

What differentiates the said Desire and Aversion (from the qualities of Material Substances, and marks them out as belonging to something other than Material Substances) is Universality and Absence of Universality

BHĀṢYA

What distinguishes the qualities of *Desire* and *Aversion* and marks them out as belonging to something other than Material Substances is '*nīyama*', '*restriction*', '*Universality*', and '*Anīyama*', '*Absence of Restriction*', i.e. *Absence of Universality*

* This is sometimes printed as Sūtra. But no such Sūtra is found either in the *Nyāyabāṇḍhā* or in *Viśvanātha's Vṛtti* or in any manuscript of the Sūtra

The 'activity and absence of activity', due to the 'Desire and Aversion of the cognisant being', are such as subsist, not in that Being, but in that on which he operates, so that the Activity and Absence of Activity should belong to only such Material Substances, Earth and the rest, as happen to be manipulated or operated upon by that Being,—and not to all Substances, so that there is in this case '*anyama*', 'absence of universality'

For one, on the other hand, who regards the Material Substances themselves as cognisant (and as such endowed with Desire and Aversion), the 'activity and absence of activity' due to Desire and Aversion would subsist in those substances themselves, and hence there should be '*niyama*', 'universality' For in the case of the other well known qualities of material substances, it is found that the action due to a quality, as also absence of action due to the cessation or obstruction of that quality, occurs in all substances so that, in the same manner the action and absence of action due to Desire and Aversion (belonging to the Material Substances) should also occur in all Material Substances,—this however is never found to be the case—from which it follows that while Activity and Absence of Activity subsist in the things operated upon or manipulated, Desire, Aversion and Effort belong to the *manipulator* *

* The qualities that are recognised by both parties as belonging to Material Substances are found in all Material Substances and continue to exist as long as those substances exist For instance, the Odour of Earth is found in all that is of Earth and lasts as long as the Earth lasts The action of *falling* due to the quality of gravity will occur in all Material Substances, and it will cease to occur only when the quality is obstructed or counteracted This is what is meant by '*niyama*, Universality restriction If Desire etc belonged to material substances these also would have been co-existent and coeval with those substances : i.e. they should have been found in all such substances, as a matter of fact, however, Desire and Aversion and Effort are not found to be so, e.g., Desire etc are never found in the Jar This is what is meant by 'Absence of Universality', *Anyama* From this we conclude that Desire etc cannot belong to Material Substances

There is some confusion here in regard to the terms '*Niyama*' and '*Anyam*'—The *Bhāṣya* has taken then in the sense of 'Universality' and 'Absence of Universality' respectively, the former belonging to the qualities of Material Substances and the latter to the qualities of the cognisant Being The *Parīkṣā* has taken the terms to mean 'restriction' and 'want of restriction', the former applying to the qualities of the Cogni-

Further, there can be no reason in support of the view that in each single body there are several cognisers, and yet according to the person who attributes Consciousness to Material Substances, inasmuch there are, in each single body, several Material Substances (Particles of Earth, Water etc), every one of which is endowed with the qualities of Desire, Aversion and Efforts,—this would mean that in a single body there are several Cognisers * If the Opponent says—"Yes, be it so",—we point out that there is no proof for such an assertion. In the case of several different bodies we infer the presence of so many different *Cognisers* from the fact that each of them is found to be possessed of distinct qualities of Cognition (Desire, Aversion, Effort, Pleasure and Pain), in the same manner, if, in each single body, every particle of Material Substance were possessed of its own Cognition and other qualities, then alone could it follow as a necessary conclusion that these are so many distinct cognisers (in that single body) [But there is no such ground for Inference.]

Further, as a matter of fact, we find that in Material Substances there appear several such actions as are due to the quality of something else,—and this provides the ground for inferring the same thing in other cases also. That is, in the case of such substances as are used as Instruments,—e.g. the axe and the like—and also in the case of such as form the con-

sant Being and the latter to those of Material Substances. This is the difference of opinion upon which Vardhamāna asserts that the term 'niyama' may mean either *universality* or *partiality*, according to the meaning that we attach to the term, and 'aniyama' is its contrary. The sense of the argument remains the same.

* In answer to what has been said in para 1, in regard to the possibility of Desire etc. being found in all Earthly substances, the Opponent might put forward the case of wine, grains of barley as a rule are not endowed with the power of intoxicating men, but those grains that enter into the composition of wine do become endowed with that power—similarly only those particles of Earth are endowed with Consciousness which enter into the composition of the body of man. It is in answer to this that the *Bhāṣya* points out that even so every particle of the material substances composing the body should be imbued with Consciousness, and as such form so many distinct cognisant beings in each body, just as each particle of wine is endowed with the power of intoxication.

stituent cause of objects—e.g. clay and the like,—we find that there appear actions that are due to the quality of others,—and this provides the ground for inferring the same thing in other cases also,—i.e. in the case of such things as the transitory and durable bodies (of Insects and Men respectively), so that we infer that the action of material substances composing these bodies,—which is indicated by the aggregation and modification of their component particles [which has been put forward by the Opponent in the *Bhāṣya* on Su 36],—is due to the quality of something different (from the material substances)* This quality (to which the said action is due) subsists in the same substratum as *Effort*, and appears in the form of 'Samskāra', 'Faculty', and is called Merit-Demerit', like the quality of *Effort*, it bears upon all things (related to the Man), and urges to activity all Material Substances, for the fulfilment of that man's purpose

The theory that Consciousness belongs to Material Substances may also be regarded as set aside by all those arguments that have been shown to prove the existence of the Soul as well as by those put forward in proof of the Eternality of the Soul, and what has been said (in Su 32 18)—in regard to Cognition not belonging to either the Sense organs or objects or perception, because Cognition persists also when these are destroyed—applies with equal force to the denying of Consciousness in the material substances of the Body†

Further, what the Opponent has urged (in Su 35)—to the effect that—"inasmuch as the said Activity and Absence of Activity are the sole indicatives of Desire and Aversion, these cannot be denied in regard to the bodies composed of Earth

* It is not only the activity of the Body as a whole, but also the action of all its component particles that go on undergoing re-arrangement during life that are all due to the quality (*Dharma* etc.) of the Soul ensouling the Body

† Because even when the Objects and the Sense-organs are destroyed, Cognition remains—it is inferred that Cognition cannot belong to them, similarly Consciousness cannot belong to the material substances in the body, because while these substances undergo changes and destruction during the life of the individual, the quality of Consciousness continues to persist all along—*Tatparya*

and other substances —is on the understanding that the terms *arambha*, Activity and 'nivṛtti', 'Absence of Activity' (used by us in Sū 34) stand for mere *action* and *cessation of action*, as a matter of fact, these two terms—Activity' and 'Absence of Activity'—stand (in Sū 34) for action of a totally different kind,* and Action of this kind is never found in Earth and other substances. Hence what has been urged (in Sū 35) to the effect that—"inasmuch as the said Activity and Absence of Activity are the sole indicatives of Desire and Aversion these cannot be denied in regard to the bodies composed of Earth and other substances"—is not right.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact our denial of Consciousness applies equally to Material Substances Sense-organs and Mind but (in the following Sūtra) we speak of *Mind* only, singling it out by way of illustration [and our reason for selecting this lies in the fact that Mind is more like the Soul than Substances or Sense organs]

Sūtra 38

(A) On account of reasons explained before,—(B) on account of these being under the control of something else,—and (C) on account of the contingency, that [if Consciousness belonged to the Mind etc.] it would mean that the results accruing (to Man) are those of acts done by others (than himself) †

BHĀṢYA

(A) The first phrase (on account of reasons explained above*) includes all that has been said, beginning from the Sūtra

* What is meant by Activity and Absence of Activity in Sū 34 is not mere *Action* and *Cessation of Action* but that particular form of action which is undertaken for the obtaining of the desirable and the getting rid of the undesirable thing, and certainly no such intelligent action is ever found in material substances. Without understanding this you have put forward your argument in Sū 35—*Tatparya*

† In place of (c) अकृतान्भ्यागमात् Viśvanātha reads स्वकृतान्भ्यागमात्, meaning—on account of the fact that what accrues to man must be the results of his own acts. The same reading is found in the Purī Sūtra N1 and also in Sūtra Ms D. The *Bhaṭṭya* the *Īrṭika* and the *Tātparya* read as in the *Viz* text.

1-1-10, 'Desire, Aversion, Effort, Pleasure, Pain and Cognition are the indicatives of the Soul';—all this goes to show that Consciousness cannot belong to Material Substances, or Sense-organs, or Mind.

(B) *On account of their being under the control of something else*;—Material Substances, Sense-organs and Mind are 'under the control of something else', in the sense that it is only under the impulse of Effort (of the Soul) that they proceed to the actions of sustaining, propelling and aggregating,* while if these were themselves conscious or intelligent, they would be independent [and this would be incompatible with the arguments that have been propounded in support of the conclusion that the Body is under the control of something else]

(C) *On account of the contingency that, if Consciousness belonged to the Mind etc., it would mean that the results accruing to Man are those of acts not done by himself*† Under Sū 1-1-17 it has been pointed out that 'Activity consists in the operating of Mind, of Speech and of Body'—[and in the *Bhāṣya* on Sū 1-1-2, it is shown that Activity, conducive to Merit-Demerit, leads to Rebirth];—now if Consciousness belonged to the Mind, or the Sense-organs, or the Material Substances, [since the Conscious beings must be independent agents, it would be those that would

* The *Tatparya* explains that these three actions refer only to the Body and the Sense-organs, the arguments being formulated thus—(a) 'The Body and the Sense-organs are under the control of something else, in the actions of sustaining, propelling and aggregating, severally—because they are material,—like the Jar, and (b) 'The Mind is under the control of something else, because it is an instrument—like the Axe. So that it is clear that all three act only under the influence of something else.

The actions mentioned,—those of sustaining, etc.,—appear to be such as belong to the Body only, it is the Body only that sustains or upholds things, that propels things, with the hand, *f* 1, and that goes on changing through the diverse aggregations of its component particles. The last however is applicable to the Sense-organs also. That is how the *Tatparya* has spoken of the three actions as referring *separately* to the Body and the Sense-organs.

† This argument is aimed against those persons who accept the authority of the Veda, and thereby regard the Man as one to whom the results of acts accrue, but still attribute Consciousness, not to Man, but to the Body, etc.

have to be regarded as the Agents of all Activity, as the *doers* of all acts,—and yet all these are destroyed at death, and the only thing that remains after death is the Soul, which, being *ex hypothesi*, *non-intelligent*, has not been the *doer* of any deed,—so that the results occurring in future births, from these acts, would fall upon the Soul, and not upon the Body, etc., and] it would mean that what is experienced by the Soul (on rebirth) is the result of acts done by others (the Body, etc.) On the other hand, if the Mind, etc. are held to be *non-intelligent* [and a being other than these, i.e., the Soul, be held to be the intelligent or Conscious entity, this latter, being independent, would be the Agent, the *doer* of all deeds], then all these would be the instruments under the control of the Conscious Agent, and hence it would be only right that the Person, the intelligent Agent, acting through those instruments (of the Mind etc.), should undergo (on Re-birth) the results of acts done by himself

Sūtra 39

(A) By reason of 'Elimination' and also (B) because the reasons adduced before are firmly established

[or (B) because of reasons adduced before and (C) by reason of Reappearance *]—

BHĀṢYA

The proposition under consideration is that 'Intelligence or Consciousness is the quality of the Soul'

(A) *Parīkṣa*, 'Elimination'—When in regard to a quality, some likely substrata being denied and eliminated, and there being no likelihood of other substrata, we have the cognition of that likely substratum which remains undenied,—we have what is called 'Cognition by Elimination'† In the present connection, for instance, we have the denial of 'Material Substances, Sense-organs and the Mind' (as likely substratum of Consciousness),—there is no other likely substance which might be suspected to be that substratum,—and the only substance that remains is the Soul—so that the conclusion is that 'Consciousness is a quality of the Soul'

* This is the second interpretation of the clause *Yathoktahorupapattitva*, by the *Bhāṣya* (see below)

† This passage also occurs in the *Bhāṣya* on 'u 1-1 5

(B) *Also because the reasons adduced before are firmly established*,—i.e. because all the reasons that have been adduced as leading to the Conception of the Soul—beginning with Su 3 1-1 onwards—have not been answered by the *Pūrvapakṣin*. The reference to *the previously adduced reasons being established* is meant to indicate (and lend support to) the aforesaid 'reasoning by Elimination' [i.e. it is on account of those reasons that we are led to the notion that the Soul is the only substance to which Consciousness can belong], and it also serves to redirect attention to the direct proofs in support of the proposition under consideration.

Or, we may take the phrase '*apapattēśca*' as putting forward an additional reason, [the meaning being as follows] —'The Soul, which is eternal having performed meritorious acts in one body, *reappears*, on the death of that body, in Heaven among divine beings while having performed sinful acts, it reappears, on death of the body in the Hells this reappearance which consists in the Soul taking to other bodies, can be possible only if the Soul is a lasting entity, on the other hand, if all that existed was a mere 'series of sensations', and there were no persisting entity in the shape of the Soul there being no substratum for the said 'reappearance', it would not be possible. Then again 'Samsara' 'series of births', which consists of the connection of a single entity with several bodies, is possible—and 'Deliverance' or 'Final Release', also, which consists of freedom from the series of bodies, is possible—[only if there is a persisting entity in the shape of the Soul], and if there be nothing apart from the 'series of sensations', since there would be nothing that could traverse the long path (of Births and Rebirths), there would be nothing that could be freed from the series of bodies, so that in that case both 'Metempsychosis' and 'Final Release' would be impossible. Further, if there were nothing but a 'series of sensations', then each individual living being would consist of several diverse entities, so that the entire phenomenon of his life would be disjointed (the act begun today and finished tomorrow being done by two distinct entities, it would not be recognised as the same on both days), undistinguishable [i.e., not properly distinguished from what belongs to another

person the entity finishing the act to day being as different from that which began it on the previous day as any strange person] and confused [as no discrimination of personalities would be possible, the entire business of the world would be mixed up] * And another inevitable result of this would be that there could be no Recollection, for what has been seen by one personality (which was present yesterday) cannot be recollected by another (that has taken its place today), for *Recollection* is only the recognition by the same cogniser of the previously perceived thing — it appearing in the form 'I have known this object before', and it is clear that in this the same cogniser re cognises what he had cognised before, and this *re-cognition* is what is called 'Recollection', and no such phenomenon could be possible if there were no other persistent entity save a 'series of Sensations'

Sutra 40

Recollection (must belong) to the Soul, for it is the Soul that is endowed with the character of the Cogniser'

BHĀṢYA

The term '*Upapadyate*' 'must belong' is to be supplied in the Sutra, the sense being that *Recollection must belong to the Soul*, and not to a mere Series of Sensations,—the particle '*tu*' expressing *certitude* ('must') 'Why so Because it is the Soul that is endowed with the character of the cogniser, i.e. 'being cogniser' is the character, the peculiar characteristic, of the Soul. It is the Soul that is spoken of as 'shall know', 'knows' and 'has known', which shows that the Soul is related to cognitions appearing at all the three points of time, and that the Soul has these cognitions pertaining to the three points of time is realised by each person in his own experience,—every person having such notions as 'I shall know', 'I know' and 'I have known' Hence it follows that he who is endowed with the said peculiar

* The *Tatparjya* explains the confusion as being due to the fact that every entity according to the Bauddha sensationalist being a mere 'negat on of contraries', all persons would be the same and no distinction as between the 'Brāhmaṇa' and the Kṣatriya and so forth would be possible, so that there would be no discrimination of their duties such as the Brāhmaṇa alone shall perform the Soma sacrifice, the Kṣatriya alone shall perform the *Rājasaṃjya* and so forth

feature, to him belongs Recollection, and not to a mere Series of Sensations, apart from the Soul

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

It has been explained (under Su 33) that 'Recollections' do not appear simultaneously, because the causes of Recollections do not appear at one and the same time, — and now the question arises—"From what causes does Recollection arise?"

The answer is that—Recollection arises—

Sūtra 41

from such causes as—(a) attention, (b) association, (c) retentiveness, (d) indicative (e) distinguishing feature, (f) likeness, (g) ownership, (h) supporter, (i) supported (j) relationship, (k) sequence, (l) separation, (m) co profession, (n) enmity, (o) superiority, (p) acquisition, (q) cover (r) pleasure and pain, (s) desire and aversion (t) fear (u) need, (v) profession, (w) affection, (x) merit and (y) demerit

BHĀṢYA

(a) *Attention*—the fixing of the Mind with the desire to recollect something, and the pondering of the peculiarities of the thing desired to be recalled—is a cause of Recollection — (b) *Association*—is either (1) the arranging of several things in a connected chain, things so connected bringing about the recollection of one another, either in the order in which they have been arranged, or in some other order, or (2) the fixing of things (in the plexuses of the Body) to be remembered with those already known,—such connecting being done with the help of the Science of Concentration (Yoga) — (c) *Retentiveness*—the Faculty produced by the repeated cognitions of like things, and this quality of Faculty, belonging to the Soul, is called 'Retentiveness', this also, like others, is a cause of Recollection — (d) *Indicative*—this is of four kinds—(1) conjunct (2) inherent, (3) co-inherent in one substratum, and (4) contradictory, (1) e.g. smoke is the *conjunct* 'indicative' of Fire (2) the horn is the *inherent* 'indicative' of the Bull, (3) the hand is the co-inherent 'indicative' of the feet, and so also is Colour of Touch, and (4) the non material substance is the *contradictory* 'indicative' of the material substance — (e) *Distinguishing feature*—as found in a living being—reminds us of the race or family to which that

being belongs,—in such forms as 'this belongs to the race of the Vidas', 'this belongs to the family of the Gargas', and so forth — (f) *Likeness*—the likeness of *Devadatta* in the picture reminds us of *Devadatta* — (g) *Ownership*—the master reminds us of the servant and the servant of the master.— (h) *Supporter*—one is reminded by the landlord of his tenants — (i) *Supported*—the tenant reminds one of the landlord — (j) *Relationship**—the pupil reminds one of the Teacher, and the Priest of the person at whose sacrificial performance he officiates — (k) *Sequence*—as in the case of a number of acts to be done one after the other (the preceding reminds us of the succeeding) — (l) *Separation*—when one is separated from a person and feels the separation, he remembers him frequently,— (m) *Co-profession*—one cutter reminds us of another cutter — (n) *Enmity*—of two rivals the sight of one reminds us of the other — (o) *Superiority*—reminds us of that which has produced the superiority — (p) *Aquisition*—when one has either acquired a thing, or wishes to acquire it he is frequently reminded of it — (q) *Cover*—when the sword is remembered by its scabbard — (r) *Pleasure and Pain*—remind us of what causes them — (s) *Desire and Aversion*—remind one of what is liked and what is disliked — (t) *Fear*—reminds one of the cause of fear— (u) *Need*—reminds one of what he needs, in the shape of food or clothing — (v) *Profession*—the chariot maker is recalled by the chariot — (w) *Affection*—one frequently remembers the woman whom he loves — (x) *Merit*—reminds one of his previous births, and Merit also enables one to retain what he reads and hears — (y) *Demerit*—reminds one of the causes of pain suffered in the past

These several causes of Recollection are never cognised at the same time, hence no simultaneous Recollections are possible

The Sutra is merely suggestive of what causes Recollection, it is by no means exhaustive †

End of Section 3

* Some sort of 'Relationship' is involved in all that is enumerated here. Hence 'Relationship' here stands for those other than the ones specially enumerated—*Tatparya*

† These are other causes also, e.g., *Insanity* tends to revive old memories—*Tatparya*

SECTION (4)

Sūtras 42-45

Apprehension vanishes soon after appearance

INTRODUCTORY BHĀŚYA

Buddhi, Apprehension, having been proved to be *non eternal*, it would follow that it vanishes soon after appearance, and yet there are several *non eternal* things* (e.g. the Jar) which continue to exist for a time more or less remote (from the time at which they are produced),—hence there arises the doubt—Is Apprehension entirely evanescent (disappearing soon after appearance), like Sound?—or is it durable for some time longer, like the Jar?

We accept the view that it is totally evanescent

“Why so?”

Sūtra 42

Because there is Apprehension of Movement which is fleeting

BHĀŚYA

Because there is apprehension of Movement which is fleeting (not durable)—In the case of the arrow shot from the bow we perceive a series of movements till the arrow drops down, and since every cognition is restricted to a single object, it follows that, just as there is a series of (fleeting) movements (in the arrow), so must there be also a series of corresponding cognitions. In the case of the apprehension of (comparatively) durable things also, inasmuch as we find that the perception ceases when the thing is hidden from view, { it follows that in this case

* The *Viz.* text as well as the *Puri* Ms. read ‘*nityānām*’ but the sense requires ‘*anityānām*’, the *Pāṇini* has neither *nityānām* nor *anityānām*. The fact of *nitya*, eternal things, being such as continue to exist longer, can have no bearing upon *Buddhi*, after this has been proved to be *non-eternal*. The meaning clearly is—‘it having been proved that *Buddhi* is *non-eternal*, this would naturally imply that it is fleeting evanescent disappearing soon after appearance; and several *non-eternal* things are found to have longer duration, hence the Doubt in regard to *Buddhi*, as to whether it is entirely evanescent or it has some duration’

With the reading ‘*nityānām*’ the only sense that can be deduced from the passage is as follows:—‘If *Buddhi* is *non-eternal*, it should be entirely evanescent, and if it is *eternal* it should continue to exist, hence the doubt

also there is a series of several evanescent cognitions], that is, when the Jar, which is durable, is perceived, we have a series of cognitions, until something comes between (the Jar and the Perceiver), it is for this reason that as soon as something happens to intervene, the perception of the Jar ceases. If Cognition were durable (not evanescent), then the perceptive cognition of the Jar should continue even when the Jar has been hidden from view [which however is not found to be the case, and hence it follows that there is a series of several evanescent cognitions]

The phenomenon of Recollection also does not* prove the durability of Cognitions, for what brings about Recollection is the *Impression* produced by the Cognition (and *not* the *Cognition* itself). Some people have argued that—"Cognition must be regarded as durable, because we find Recollection of things apprehended by the Cognition,—and no such Recollection would be possible if its cause, in the shape of the corresponding Cognition, were non eternal." But the fact put forward is no proof (of the proposition set forth). 'Why? Because what brings about the Recollection is, not the Cognition, but, the Impression produced by the Cognition, and this Impression is a quality entirely different from the Cognition.

What is said cannot be accepted, because no reason has been adduced in its support.

[The reason is this]—If Cognition were something durable, then the perception itself would continue for a long time, and there would be no room for *Recollection* at all. That is so long as the original Perception would continue to exist, the object cognised would remain 'perceptible', and while the Perception itself is there, no 'Recollection' is possible.

* The Puri Mss. read *smṛtiśca lingam*. Re-collection does prove in that case *buddhyarasthane* should read as *buddhyarjasthane*. But the reading of the P'ra text gives better sense. Things seen now are remembered after several days: this might be regarded as indicating that the cognition of the thing has continued to exist during all these days. But the fact is that the cognition is *not* the immediate cause of Re-collection which is directly produced by the Impression left by the Cognition.

Sūtra 43

[*Objection*].—"If Cognition were evanescent, the perception of things would be always indistinct, just like the indistinct perception of Colour during lightning-flash"

BHĀṢYA

"If Cognition is evanescent, then the perception of all cognisable things should be indistinct, just as during lightning flash, the light of the flash being evanescent, the perception of colour is indistinct. As a matter of fact, however, the perception of things is quite distinct. Hence the view (that 'Cognitions are evanescent') cannot be right."

Sūtra 44

[*Answer*].—The very reason put forward implies the admission of what is sought to be denied

BHĀṢYA

What is sought to be denied (by the Opponent) is that 'Cognition is evanescent', and this is exactly what is admitted when he asserts (in Sū 43) that 'the cognition should be indistinct like the indistinct cognition of Colour during lightning flash.' For if cognition is *indistinct*, it follows that it is also *evanescent*.

As a matter of fact, the diversity in the character (distinct or indistinct) of Cognitions is due to the diverse nature of their causes, and not to any diversity in the cognitions themselves.* That is, the fact that Cognition is at one time distinct and at another indistinct, is due to the diverse nature of the causes of Cognitions, so that where the cause of the Cognition is evanescent, the Cognition is *indistinct*, while where the cause is lasting, the Cognition is *distinct*, and the said distinctness or indistinctness is not due to the non evanescence and evanescence respectively of Cognitions. "Why? Because 'Cognition' is the apprehension of a thing, be it distinct or indistinct, it is what is called 'Cognition'. What happens is that, when the special features of a thing are not perceived,—and only its general features are perceived,—then the Cognition is *distinct*, [so far as the cognition

* This has been generally printed as Sūtra. But neither the *Nyāyamañjari*, nor *Viśvanātha*, nor any Sūtra-Ms. reads any such Sūtra.

of these general features is concerned], † and if a further Cognition of something else (in the shape of the special features) does not appear, this is due to the absence of the necessary causes, when again the thing is perceived, as along with its general features, and also as along with its special features—then the Cognition is clearly distinct [so far as both features are concerned],—and where the special features being unperceived, the general features alone are perceived, the cognition is clearly *indistinct*—[but only so far as the special features are concerned] In the present context, *the presence of special features* is clearly 'something else' (*viśayāntara*) in comparison with *the presence of general features*, and if there is no cognition of the 'something else', [and there is consequent *indistinctness*], this is due to the absence of the causes of that cognition,—and not to the evanescent character of the Cognition (as the Opponent seems to think)

In fact a cognition that is quite in keeping with the character of its *object* is always *distinct*, so that each Cognition pertaining to its own particular object, even the cognition of generalities, should be regarded as *distinct*, so far as its own particular *object* is concerned, and similarly the cognition of peculiarities should be regarded as *distinct*, so far as its own object is concerned, for the simple reason that each cognition pertains to its own particular object. So that when the Opponent brings forward (against us) the contingency of cognitions being *indistinct*,—what is that object of which the cognition would have to be *indistinct*, on account of the *evanescence of cognitions*?

As a matter of fact, there being several features in the object perceived, there arises a diversity in the cognitions (of that object), and it is to the presence or absence of such diversity that distinctness or indistinctness is due. That is, every object has two kinds of features, general and special, and in regard to each of these there are diverse cognitions, if both these kinds

† It appears better to read this passage as *सिमान्यग्रहणमात्रमव्यक्तग्रहणम्*—the meaning being that when general features are perceived and not the special features, the cognition is '*indistinct*'. But in deference to the *Ī ārtika*—and in view of the reading in all *Mss*, and in view of that follows below—we have admitted the reading of the *Viz* text and translated it in accordance with the explanation of the *Ī ārtika*.

of features are present (and perceived) in an object, then the Cognition is *distinct*, so far as that object is concerned, if however only the general features are perceived, the Cognition is *indistinct*. It is in this manner that we can explain the appearance of *distinct and indistinct cognitions*.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact also, mere *evanescence*, either of the cognition or of the cognised object, does not necessarily make the Apprehension indistinct [as the Pūrvaśākin asserts in Sū 43]* What has been urged is,—

Sūtra 43

not true, the said perception would be like the distinct perception of the continuous series of lamp flames

BHĀṢYA

Even if Cognition is evanescent, the perception of things must be regarded as *distinct*—why?—because it is *like the perception of the continuous series of lamp flames* i.e., when the flames of a lamp appear in a continuous series every one of the perceptions thereof is evanescent, as also is every one of the individual flames perceived, and inasmuch as every perception pertains to its own individual object there exist as many perceptions as there are flames and yet in this case we find that the perception of each of these flames is quite distinct

End of Section (4)

SECTION (5)

Sūtras 46-55

Consciousness is not a quality of the Body

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Consciousness or Sentience would appear to be a quality of the Body, as it is found to be present when the Body is present, and absent when the Body is absent, but—

* In Sū 44 the author has met the Pūrvaśākin by a sort of silence, pointing out to him that his own statement admits what he seeks to demolish. Now, in the following Sūtra he states his real argument against the Opponent's contention

Sūtra 46 *

as a matter of fact, in Substances we perceive their own qualities as also the qualities of others, so that the matter is open to doubt

BHĀṢYA

The mere fact of Consciousness being present when the Body is present leaves the matter doubtful, for in water we perceive Fluidity, which is its own quality, as also *warmth*, which is the quality of another substance (Fire) Hence when we perceive Consciousness in the Body, there arises a doubt as to whether the Consciousness perceived is the quality of the Body itself or it is the quality of some other substance

Sūtra 47

[Siddhānta]

Consciousness is not a quality of the Body "Why "

Because Colour and other qualities continue to exist as long as the Body exists

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, the Body is never found to be without colour and such other qualities, without *Consciousness*, on the other hand, it is actually found (when it is dead, for instance), in the same manner as Water is found without warmth Hence the conclusion is that Consciousness is not a quality of the Body [just as warmth is not a quality of water] *

"It may be like Embellishment (or Momentum)

That cannot be, as there is no cessation of any cause (of Consciousness) In the case of Embellishment, it is found that when it ceases to exist in an object, (the Body, e g) this object is not quite the same as what it was when the Embellishment was present; for as a matter of fact, Embellishment ceases to appear in an object only when the object has become deprived of those

* The reason is formulated in the form of a Hypothetical Reasoning by Viśvanatha—'If Consciousness were a quality of the Body, it would, like Colour etc., exist as long as the Body exists' The *Parasuddhi* formulates it in the form of a regular Inference: 'Consciousness, etc., are not the quality of the Body,—because, like Sound, they do not exist as long as their substratum' Colour, in this case, being treated as an Instance *per contra*.

factors (such as Propulsion and the like) that were conducive to the appearance of the Embellishment;—in the case in question on the other hand, when Consciousness ceases to appear in the Body, the Body is exactly what it was when Consciousness appeared in it [and there is no deprival of any factors, the only cause of Consciousness, according to the Opponent, consisting in the Body itself, which is still intact] Hence (the case of Consciousness not being analogous to that of Embellishment) it is not right to urge, in answer to our argument, that "the absence of Consciousness in the Body is like the absence of Embellishment"

If (in order to escape from the said difficulty) it be held that the cause of Consciousness in the Body is something else (and not the Body itself), then this cause could subsist either in the Body itself, or in some other Substance or in both (the Body as well as another Substance) And none of these views can be maintained, because there would be no reason for any restriction (such as the following) (a) The cause of Consciousness subsisting in the Body itself, there would be no reason for any such restriction as that Consciousness should appear therein at certain times, and not at others, —(b) the cause of Consciousness being in some other substance, there can be no reason for the restriction that while Consciousness appears in the Body, it does not appear in pieces of stone and such other things,* —(c) if the cause of Consciousness subsists in both (Body and the other substance), there can be no reason for the restriction that Consciousness appears in the Body, and not in other substances that belong to the same category as that Body

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Some people might argue thus —"In the case of the object possessed of the quality of dark colour (e.g. the unbaked Jar), we find that there is cessation of that Colour (while the object continues to exist), and in the same manner there may be cessation of the quality of Consciousness (while the Body, of which it is a quality, continues to exist)"

Sūtra 48

This however is not right, because (in the case of the object cited) there is appearance of another Colour due to baking

* Part Ms. B rightly reads a *va* after 'T-ṣ' *Idhityatra*.

BHĀṢYA

In the case of the object cited (*i.e.* the jar) there is not a total disappearance of all Colour all that happens is that the *dark* Colour having disappeared another Colour, *red*, is produced by baking —in the case of the Body, on the other hand, there is, at death a total disappearance of Consciousness (and nothing appears in its place) *

Sutra 49

Further,

Inasmuch as qualities produced by heat are found to be due to the presence of counter-active forces the criticism based upon the analogy of these cannot be right

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact qualities are found to be produced by heat in only such substances in which there are present forces counter active (destructive) of the previous quality that this is so is shown by the fact that the qualities produced by heat are incompatible with the previous qualities In the Body on the other hand we do not find present any force counteractive of the quality of Consciousness—by reason of the presence whereof there could appear any new quality incompatible with the (previous) quality of *Consciousness* and it is only from the appearance of such new quality that the counter action (destruction) of Consciousness (and hence the impossibility of its continuing as long as the Body lasts) could be inferred Thus there being nothing to counteract the quality of Consciousness it should continue in the Body as long as the Body lasts (if it is a quality of the Body) As a matter of fact however it does not so continue to exist Hence the conclusion is that Consciousness is not a quality of the Body

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

For the following reason also Consciousness cannot be a quality of the Body —

* Viśvanātha takes this to mean
The Siddhānta ones destroyed
pro? th

from the Opponent
find new
substance

Sūtra 50

Because it pervades over the entire Body *

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, like the Body, all its component parts also are pervaded by the appearance of Consciousness and there is not a single part of the Body where Consciousness does not appear under the circumstances, if Consciousness belonged to the Body, this would mean that, like the Body, all its component parts are Conscious and hence in each single person there would be several conscious entities † So that, just as the restriction in regard to Pleasure, Pain and Cognition [that the Pleasure appearing in Devadatta's body is felt by him alone, and not by Yājñadatta and so forth] is indicative of the fact that there are several conscious beings—one to each individual body,—so would it also be in regard to the single body [every component part of which being endowed with Consciousness, it would follow that there is restriction as to the Pleasure, etc., of each such part so that the Pleasure appearing in one part of the Body would be felt by that part alone, and not by any other part of that same Body] As a matter of fact however, no such thing actually happens. Hence we conclude that Consciousness is not a quality of the Body.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[Objection] "It has been said that 'there is no part of the body where Consciousness does not appear', but—

Sūtra 51

* This is not right, † as it is not found in such parts of the body as hairs and nails

* According to the *Parīśuddhi*, this Sūtra contains the following argument — Consciousness cannot be a specific quality of the Body—because it is a quality that pervades over the whole of its substratum—like Sound. It goes on to remark,—"This meaning of the Sūtra was so clear and patent that the *Bhāṣyākāra* did not think it necessary to mention it, and he put down only that interpretation of it whereby it became connected with and introductory to, the following Sūtras."

† The no, appearing in the *Viz.* text as part of the *Bhāṣya*, should form part of the Sūtra, such being the reading of all Sūtra-texts.

BHĀṢYA

"In hairs and in nails we do not feel any Consciousness appearing ; so that it is not right to say that it pervades over the entire body "

Sūtra 52

[Answer]—Inasmuch as the Body extends only so far as the skin, there is no possibility of Consciousness appearing in such things as Hairs and Nails

BHĀṢYA

'Body' has been defined as 'the substratum of Sense organs', so that the Body, which is the receptacle of life, mind, pleasure, pain and cognition, can be regarded as extending only up to the skin, hence it is natural that no Consciousness would appear in the Hairs and Nails. The presence of such things as Nails and Hairs in the Body is due to the action of certain things [and they do not form constituent parts of the Body]

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

For the following reason also Consciousness cannot be a quality of the Body —

Sūtra 53

Because it differs in character from the qualities of the Body

BHĀṢYA

Qualities belonging to the Body are of two kinds—(1) Imperceptible, e.g., Gravity, and (2) Perceptible by the senses, e.g., Colour, etc. Consciousness is a quality of a totally different kind from the said qualities. It cannot be regarded as *imperceptible*, because it is capable of being sensed (perceived) by itself, nor can it be regarded as *perceptible by the senses*, because it is cognisable by the Mind*. From this it follows that Consciousness is the quality of a substance totally different from the Body

* The correct order appears in the *Vartika*. The right reading would appear to be नाप्रत्यक्षं मनोविषयत्वात् नेन्द्रियग्राह्यं स्वसंवेद्यत्वात् and the right translation should be—'It cannot be regarded as *imperceptible*, as it is *perceived* by the Mind (which is an organ), nor can it be regarded as *perceptible* (i.e. perceived through an organ) as it is *cognised* by itself.'

Sūtra 54

[*Objection*].—"What is urged is not right, as there is difference in character among Colour and other qualities (belonging to the Body)".

BHĀṢYA

"Just as, even though differing in character from one another, Colour and the other qualities do not cease to be qualities of the Body, in the same manner, Consciousness also, though differing in character from Colour and the other qualities, need not cease to be a quality of the Body."

Sūtra 55

[*Answer*].—Inasmuch as Colour and the other qualities (of the Body) are perceptible by the Senses, there is no incongruity in these (belonging to the Body)

BHĀṢYA

'Also because they are not perceptible'—(this should be added to the *Sūtra*), [the meaning of the *Sūtra* being] Colour etc., though differing among themselves, yet do not go beyond the limits of the two kinds (mentioned under *Sū* 53), and Consciousness also, differing from Colour etc., should fall within the limits of these two kinds, if it were really a quality of the Body,—as a matter of fact, however, Consciousness is found (as shown under *Sū* 53) to lie beyond the limits of the said two kinds—hence it follows that Consciousness cannot be a quality of the Body

Though the fact of Consciousness not belonging to the Body has already been established by what has been said above (in Section 3) in regard to Cognition not belonging to Material Substances, or Sense-organs, or Mind,—yet it has been dealt with over again (in the present Section), for the purpose of stating additional arguments (such as pertain to the Body specifically), specially because the more is truth investigated the more fully established it becomes

End of Section 5

SECTION (6)

[Sūtras 56-59]

Treating of the Mind

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The character of Apprehension having been examined, it is now the turn of Mind to be examined, and the question arising—Is there only one Mind in each body, or several? *—[the answer is—

Sūtra 56

The Mind must be one only since there is non simultaneity of Cognitions

There are two kinds of 'non simultaneity of cognitions'—(1) the non-simultaneity of several cognitions produced through the same Sense-organ, and (2) the non-simultaneity of cognitions of several things produced through several Sense-organs. Of these two the former is not what is spoken of as indicating the singleness of the Mind,—this 'non-simultaneity' being due to the fact that one Instrument (such as Sense-organs are) can, by its very nature, accomplish only one thing at a time—it is the latter 'non-simultaneity' of the cognitions of several things through several Sense-organs that is regarded as indicating the singleness of Mind. "How does that non simultaneity indicate the singleness of Mind?" If there were several Minds, it would be possible for several Sense-organs to be in contact with several Minds simultaneously whereby there should be several cognitions appearing (through these contacts) at one and the same time,—but this never happens—hence the conclusion is that, inasmuch as cognitions of things appear only one after another—and never simultaneously—there is a single Mind (in one body)

* It has been explained in Su 1 1 16 that 'the non simultaneity of Cognitions is the indicative of Mind' this would not be true if there were several Minds in a body or if the Mind were of large dimension. The present enquiry is undertaken for the purpose of finding out some means of concentrating the Mind, attempts at concentration could be fruitful only if there were only one Mind, if there were several Minds there need be no attempt at concentration, and no abstraction of the Mind or Meditation would be possible

Sūtra 57

[Objection]—“What has been asserted is not right, for as a matter of fact, we do perceive several actions (cognitions) actually appearing simultaneously ”

BHĀṢYA

“ [When the pupil perceives his Teacher going in the forest] he has the following notions,—‘This Teacher reads—walks—holds the water-pot—looks at the path—hears the sounds proceeding from the forest—becomes frightened—keeps on the lookout for signs of serpents or tigers—remembers the place of destination*’,—he does not notice any order of sequence among these cognitions, so that all these may be regarded as appearing simultaneously —and hence it follows that there are several Minds ”

Sūtra 58

[Answer]—The said perception is like the perception of the fire-circle, and is due to the rapidity of motion

BHĀṢYA

In the case of the whirling fire brand even though there is sequence [among the several perceptions of the fire, yet it is not perceived, by reason of the extreme rapidity of motion, and the sequence not being perceived, there arises the idea of the continuity (of fire in revolution), which gives rise to the notion that there is a single circle of fire,—similarly in the case of cognitions also, Sequence, even though present, fails to be perceived by reason of the rapidity of the cognitions or actions, and the Sequence failing to be perceived there arises the notion that the actions (or cognitions) appear simultaneously

“But is the notion of the simultaneity of cognitions due to the non perception of sequence in them? Or, is the perception of simultaneity due to the actual existence of simultaneity? —You do not show any cause for accepting the one or the other view in preference to the other, [so that the matter must be open to doubt] ”

* The *Tātparya* adopts the reading गल्ययनम् and explains it as स्थायनम्. The right reading appears to be that found in the Pura Ms B स्थानियम्.

We have already explained that cognitions of several things, due to the action of the sense organs, appear one after the other, and this cannot be denied, being directly perceptible by each man for himself. Further, whenever we think of a number of things seen or heard before, our ideas of them always appear one after the other, and never simultaneously, and from this also we can infer (that the cognitions in the case cited in Su 57 are not simultaneous)

In the case of the cognitions of syllables, words and sentences, and those of their meanings, sequence fails to be perceived by reason of rapidity. 'How so?' [As a matter of fact the phenomenon involves the following process]—When the several syllables composing a sentence are pronounced, there appears one auditory perception in connection with each one of those syllables,—then the hearer recognises one or several syllables as forming a *word*,—having recognised the word, he ponders over it—by this pondering he recalls the meaning of that word,—ponders over a number of words as constituting one *sentence*,—having cognised the meanings of the words as syntactically connected he recognises the meaning of the sentence—Even though there are so many cognitions involved (in the process of our comprehension of the meaning of a sentence) yet by reason of the rapidity with which they appear, their sequence fails to be perceived. This example explains the ordinary notion of *simultaneity* that people have in regard to Cognitions.

[While the above facts cannot be gainsaid by either party]—in support of the contrary view—that Cognitions do actually appear simultaneously, there is no instance which is free from doubt (and admitted by both parties), on the strength of which it could be inferred that there are several Minds in a body.

Sūtra 59

For reasons already mentioned, the Mind must be atomic
BHĀṢYA

That Mind is *atomic* and that it is *one*—both these properties of the Mind follow from the *non simultaneity of Cognitions*. If

the Mind were something *large*, then it would be possible for it to be in contact with several sense organs at one and the same time, and this should give rise to several Cognitions *simultaneously*

End of Section 6

SECTION (7)

Sūtras 60 72

The Body is formed under the Influence of the Unseen Force (of Destiny)

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

*The Mind, along with the Sense organs is found to operate only within the Body, never outside the Body of the cognising person also, all experiencing of objects consisting of apprehension etc., is found to occur only in the Body, so also his acquiring of the desired and abandoning of the undesired thing,—and all other operations carried on by man. With regard to the Body, there is a diversity of opinion which gives rise to the

* Since the Mind operates only in the Body it is only right that the exact nature of the Body should be examined after the character of the Mind has been discussed —says the *Vartika*. An examination of the Mind requires an examination of its receptacle Body also— the *Tatparjya* adds.

The use of the present enquiry consists in the determining of the relation of a particular Soul with a particular Body and the birth and Final Release of that Soul as also what is called Death. If we can prove that the connection of the Soul with the Body is due to the past deeds of that Soul all these phenomena become explained thus alone is use found for the laws relating to the duties of the several castes and conditions of man. Thus it is that all that has gone before in the *Nyāyasūtra* becomes justified—*Parissuddhi*.

Man's experiences occur in the Body the Mind like all sense-organs, functions in the Body, and these facts can be explained only on the basis of Man's body being due to his past deeds. Hence the necessity of the present enquiry. It would seem that the proper occasion for this investigation was the Section that dealt with the Body itself. But it comes in more naturally in connection with the Mind, which is the principal instrument of all man's pleasure, pain etc.

Some people think that the Body of the child is due to the *Karma* not of the child itself, but of the Father. But this is not right, because the Body of man must be the product of the acts of that person who regards that Body as himself, and acts for the experiences obtained through and in that Body —*V'ardhamana*.

following doubt '—Is the formation of the man's Body due to his 'Karma', or, is it the product of the material substances, independently of any 'Karma'? We hear several opinions expressed on this point. The truth on this point is as follows'—

Sūtra 60

The formation of the Body is due to the persistence of the effect of previous acts.

BHĀṢYA

The term '*pūrvakṛtam*', 'previous', stands for those deeds, or actions in the shape of the 'Activity of Speech, Thought and Bodily activity', that were done (by the person) in his previous body,—the 'effect' of the said 'acts' consists of *Merit and Demerit* produced by them,—the '*anubandha*', 'persistence', of that 'effect', means the continuing of it as subsisting in the Soul,—and the formation of the Body is out of the material substances as operated upon by the said '*persistence of Merit and Demerit*', and not out of the material substances by themselves. That particular Body belongs to a Soul subsisting in which the Soul regards it as 'I', attached to which and desiring experiences in which that Soul obtains the various kinds of objects and acquires (brings about) Merit and Demerit, and when this Body falls off (on death), another is brought into existence by the force of the 'Faculty' in the shape of the said '*Merit and Demerit*' along with (and operating upon) the material substances, when this second body has come into existence, there go on again actions for the fulfilment of the man's purposes, just as in the previous body, and the man's activities go on as in the previous body. All this phenomenon is possible only on the basis of the assumption that the production of the Body is out of the material substances as operated upon by the Soul's acts. In the case of such objects as the chariot and the like, we find that being intended for the accomplishment of man's purpose, they are brought into existence out of such material substances as are operated upon by man's quality in the shape of *Effort*, and on the analogy of this we can infer that the Body, being meant to accomplish the man's purposes, comes into existence out of such material substances as are operated upon by some qualities belonging to the man (such for instance as his Merit and Demerit)

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

On this point the Atheist argues as follows —

Sūtra 61

"The formation of the Body out of material substances is exactly like the production of material bodies out of material substances "

BHĀṢYA

"From out of material substances themselves—independently of 'Karma'—are produced material bodies, in the shape of Sands, Pebbles, Stones, Orpiment and Soot and they are taken up (by men) on account of their being capable of accomplishing the purposes of man. In the same manner the Body, being produced, out of material substances independently of man's 'Karma', would be taken up by him, on account of its being conducive to his purposes "

Sūtra 62

This cannot be accepted because what is urged is still to be proved.

BHĀṢYA

Just as it is still to be proved that 'the formation of the Body is independent of Karma', so is it still to be proved that the production of Sands, Pebbles, Stones, Orpiment, Soot and such things is independent of Karma', so that being itself still to be proved, the said premiss cannot serve as a valid reason

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

What has been urged (in *Sūtra 61*) in regard to the 'production of material bodies out of material substances',—any analogy between this and the case in question—

Sūtra 63

there is none, because Parents are the cause of formation (of the Body)

BHĀṢYA

What has been urged by the Atheist bears no analogy to the case in question. "Why?" Because the 'material bodies' mentioned (Sands etc.) are produced without seeds; while the Body is always produced from seeds. The term 'parents' stands for the ovule and semen, which constitute the 'seeds' (of the Body),

that there is no conception when the necessary influence of *Karman* (Destiny) is absent, and when this influence is present conception does take place. This is the only explanation possible of the said uncertainty of conception. If the material substances were independent (of any such influence as Destiny), there should be certainty of conception, for under that hypothesis, there would be no element wanting in the causes necessary for the formation of the Body.

Further,

Sūtra 66

Just as *Karman* (Destiny) is the cause of the formation of the Body, so is it also of the connection of the Body (with a particular Soul) *

BHĀṢYA

It is, as a matter of fact, impossible for the Body to be formed out of the Earth and other material substances, independently of Destiny, —as the Body consists of an aggregation, brought about by means of an arrangement or disposition, most difficult to encompass, of such (heterogeneous) components as—(1) the arteries through which the bodily humours and life-breath flow, (2) the humours of the body culminating in the semen, (3) the Tendon, Skin, Bones, Veins, Muscle, Embryo and Fœtus, (4) head, arms and belly, (5) the thighs, (6) the wind, Bile and Phlegm permeating the Body, and (7) the mouth, throat, chest, stomach, intestines and bowels —consequently we conclude that its formation is due to Destiny. In the same manner if among the causes (bringing about the body) there is nothing that is related to any particular Soul, the Earth and other material substances that would constitute the body would be

* This *Sūtra* anticipates the objection that, when a body is born, it comes into contact with all Souls—since all are equally omnipresent,—so that a body should belong to all Souls equally. The answer is that, though in a general way all Souls are in contact with the Body, yet the special connection of the body with one individual Soul is due to the Destiny of that Soul, which Destiny determines the exact body fit for the experiences in store for that Soul.

Would it not be simpler to take the *Sūtra* to mean that 'the connection of Parents also is due to the Destiny of the Soul to be born of these parents'? This would be more in keeping with the context.

equally related to all the Souls—among whom there would be nothing to distinguish one from the other,—and there being nothing in the Earth etc., themselves that would connect them with any one Soul, and not with the rest, the Body formed out of these would be the common substratum for the pleasure, pain and cognition of all the Souls—as a matter of fact, however, each Body is found to be connected with only one particular Soul, and the only explanation of this restriction is that *Karman* (Destiny) is a cause that brings about the formation of the Body so that the karmic residuum of each Soul being restricted to itself, it produces a Body fit for being the substratum of the experiences of that particular Soul in which the residuum subsists, and connects that body with that Soul. Thus it is found that just as *Destiny is the cause of the formation of the Body, so is it also of the connection of that Body with a particular Soul*. What we mean by 'connection' is the relation that each Body bears to an individual Soul.

Sūtra 67

By what has been said in the preceding Sūtra the absence of universality has been explained [i.e., shown to be impossible, inexplicable under the Pūrva prakṣa] *

BHĀṢYA

What is called '*anīyama*' 'absence of universality', has been explained—by what has been said in the preceding Sūtra,—'just as *Destiny is the cause of the formation of the Body so is it also of the connection of that Body with a particular Soul—as impossible and inexplicable under the theory that the formation of the Body is not due to Destiny* †

* All the commentaries explain this Sūtra as aimed against the following Sāṅkhya-doctrine —'The formation of the Body is not due to Destiny it is due to the functioning of Primordial Matter—this Primordial Matter through its own inherent activity, independently of Merit Demerit etc., evolves the several products.'

† The Sūtra has been rendered according to the explanation provided by the Commentators. Would it not be simpler to render it as follows—'What has been said disposes of the objection that there could be no restriction as to which Soul should have which Body.'

† The *Tatparya* has adopted the reading योऽयमवर्त्मनिमित्तसंगे मते अनियमः कर्मव्यवस्थेन प्रत्युक्त which has been construed as —योऽयमनियमः

Q "What does *Niyama*, 'Universality', mean here ?"

A What is called 'Universality' here is the idea that *the body of one Soul is the same as that of all Souls*, so that what is meant by '*anīyama*', 'absence of Universality', is *diversity, distinction, peculiarity*,—i.e., the idea that *the body of one Soul is different from that of another*.*

As a matter of fact, we actually find such diversity or distinction in the birth of bodies as (a) one is born in a high family, another in a low family, (b) one is praiseworthy and another blameworthy, (c) one is full of diseases while another is free from diseases, (d) one is full bodied while another is maimed, (e) one is full of suffering while another is full of happiness, (f) one is endowed with excellent characteristics of man while another is quite the contrary, (g) one is endowed with good properties while another possesses bad properties, (h) one has efficient and another weak sense-organs [These are the cruder differences ordinarily perceptible] There are several subtler differences, which are innumerable. All this diversity in the birth of Bodies can be due only to the Destiny attaching to each individual Soul (which determines the character of the Body into which that Soul is going to be born). On the other hand, if there were no such diverse Destinies attaching to individual Souls, (as influencing the birth of the Body), then—there being no difference among the Souls themselves, and the Earth and other material substances (as constituting Primordial Matter) being the same in all cases, and there being nothing in these substances to lead to any restriction,—it would come to this that all bodies belong to all Souls. As a matter of fact, however, the life of Souls is not found to be so (that is, such as all bodies belong to all Souls).

इत्युच्यते अयं अकर्मनिमित्तसंगे मते .. प्रत्युक्त The *Tatparjya* explains the purport as follows—'the absence of Universality—i.e., the fact that no single Body can be common to all Souls—that has been described in the preceding Sūtra—has been explained—i.e., shown to be impossible under the theory that the formation of the Body is brought about by material substances independently of any such influence as that of Destiny.'

* '*Niyama*' stands for *Universality*, the idea of all Souls having a common body; '*Anīyama*' means *non universality*, the idea that one Soul has one body and another a totally different one—*Tatparjya*

Hence the conclusion is that the formation of the Body cannot but be due to the influence of Destiny.

Further, the separation (freedom) of the Soul from the Body is also rendered possible by the possibility of the exhaustion of *Karman* (Destiny) * That is to say, when the formation of the Body is due to Destiny, it becomes possible for the Soul to be come separated (freed) from that body —“How?”—*Through the possibility of the exhaustion of Destiny* It is possible for Destiny to be exhausted in the following manner —Right Knowledge having destroyed Illusion, the person becomes free from all attachment,—he commits no further deeds, by body, speech, or mind, which could lead to his re birth, so that there is no further accumulation of Destiny, and all past accumulation becomes exhausted by his passing through the experiences resulting therefrom, thus (in the absence of Destiny) there being nothing to bring about a further Body, when the present Body falls off, no further Body is formed, and hence there is no further bondage (for that Soul) If the formation of the Body were not due to Destiny,—as of the material substance (Primordial Matter) itself there can be no destruction,—there would be no possibility of the Soul ever becoming freed from the Body

Sūtra 68

† If it be asserted that—“the formation of the Body is due to ‘adṛṣṭa’ [(a) ‘non perception’, or (b) unseen quality]”

* This appears as *Sūtra* in the *112* text But no such *Sūtra* is found in the *Nyāyasūtra nibandha* nor in *Sūtra* *Mss* C and D nor in *Viśvanātha* a *Vṛtti*

† The *112* text as also the *Nyāyasūtrinibandha*, includes this clause also under the *Sūtra* But neither *Viśvanātha* nor any *Sūtra* *Mss* reads the *Sūtra* so, according to these the form of the *Sūtra* is simply *punarātpra-rāgo pararge* But from the *Bhāṣya* below it is clear that the text of the *Sūtra* is as translated

The *Vṛttika* and the *Tatparya* explain this objection as proceeding from the *Sāṅkhya* (A) The *Bhāṣya* latter on P 191, L 10 offers another explanation whereby the objection is represented as coming from the *Jains* (B)

The *Tatparya* has explained the term ‘*Adṛṣṭa*’ of the *Sūtra*,—which the *Bhāṣya* says is synonymous here with ‘*adarīṣṭa*’, non-perception—to mean the non perception of such objects of enjoyment as Sound and the like, as also the non perception of the distinction between Soul and Matter

—then [our answer is that] in that case, even after final release there would be likelihood of a Body being produced

BHĀṢYA

[A] "It is *adars'ana*, 'non perception', that is spoken of as *adarsa*, (in the Sūtra) As a matter of fact, the formation of the Body is brought about by 'non perception' That is, as long as the Body has not been formed, the perceiver, being without a receptacle (abode), cannot perceive things, the things to be perceived by him being of two kinds—(a) the object (Sound, Taste, Odour etc.) and the diversity or difference between the Unmanifested (Primordial Matter) and the Soul,—and it is (in view of this 'non perception', and) for this purpose (of accomplishing the perception of these two kinds of things) that the Body is brought into existence. Hence when the said perception (of both kinds of things) has been accomplished, the material substances have done all they had to do (in connection with that perceiving Soul) and consequently do not produce any other Body for him, and in this manner the 'separation from Body' becomes possible."

If you hold the above view, then our answer is that—in that case, even after Final Release, there would be likelihood of a further Body being born. That is, there would be likelihood of another Body being produced for that Soul. According to you, there is one 'non-perception'—i.e., impossibility of perception—while the Body has not been formed, and there is impossibility of perception after the Body has ceased to exist,—which also is another 'non perception',—and between these two 'non perceptions' there is no difference, so that, even after Final Release, inasmuch as 'non perception' [which, according to you, is the sole cause of the production of the Body] would be there, there would be every likelihood of another Body being produced.

"But the fact of the purpose of the Body production having been accomplished forms the point of difference (between the two 'non-perceptions')"*

This cannot be right, because, as a matter of fact, we find production or accomplishment as well as non accomplishment

* This is sometimes printed as Sūtra. But no such Sūtra is found anywhere

That is, if what you mean to urge is that—"When perception (of ordinary things, and of the difference between Soul and Matter) has been accomplished, the material substances have their purpose fulfilled, and as such, do not go to form another Body; and this forms the point of difference [wherein one kind of 'non perception', that due to the cessation of the Body upon Final Release, differs from the other kind of 'non perception', that due to the non-existence of the Body, before it has been produced],"—then, our answer is that this cannot be right, because we find production on accomplishment as well as on non accomplishment, that is, as a matter of fact, we find that Bodies are produced again and again (for the non released Soul), even though the material substances have their purpose fulfilled by the Soul's perception of the things of the world, and inasmuch as the Bodies produced again and again do not (always) bring about the perception of difference between Soul and Matter (which is the only purpose left to be accomplished for the Soul by these subsequent bodies), the production of all these bodies must be regarded as purposeless.

From all this it is clear that, under the theory that the creation of things is not due to Destiny, the formation of the Body cannot be regarded as being for the purposes of 'Perception', while under the theory that the said creation is due to Destiny, the formation of the Body can be rightly regarded as being for the purposes of 'Perception', as (under this latter theory) 'Perception' consists in *experience* which is the result of deeds done (i.e. Destiny)

[B] The clause '*tadadr̥ṣṭakaritam*' may be taken as representing the theory of other philosophers —"*Adr̥ṣṭa* is the name of a particular quality of Atoms, which brings about action or movement (vibration), it is when urged by this quality that the Atoms combine and bring about the Body, whereupon this Body is entered by the Mind, which also is urged to it by its own quality of '*Adr̥ṣṭa*', and when the Body has become entered by the Mind then the Perceiver begins to have his perceptions"

The answer to this theory also is that—"there is likelihood of another Body being produced"—since the Mind is not destroyed, that is, even after Final Release, there would be likelihood of a further Body being produced, as '*Adr̥ṣṭa*', the quality of Atoms, is indestructible (and hence persists even after Release)

were due to the material substances themselves, independently of Destiny, what would that be the exhaustion whereof could lead to the fall of the Body, which is called 'death'? And there being no death, we understand that *the Body should have to be regarded as ever lasting* For if Death were due to mere chance, (and not to a specific cause relating specifically to the individual), then there could be no difference in the manner of death (in several persons) *

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The Opponent,—with a view to criticise what has been urged against him, to the effect that 'there would be likelihood of another Body being produced' (Su 68),—argues as follows :—

Sūtra 71

"It would be like the eternality of the dark colour of the Atom '†

BHĀṢYA

"Just as the dark colour of the Atom (of Clay) is eternal, and yet when it is obstructed (set aside) by fire-contact (in baking), it does not appear again,—in the same manner the Body, though formed by the Unseen Quality (of the Atoms) would not appear again, after Final Release "

Sūtra 72

That cannot be, as this would involve (A) the admission of what is not supported (by reasoning or fact)§ [(B) or, the accruing of what is not earned]

BHĀṢYA

(A) The instance cited (in Su 71) cannot be right,—
"Why?"—*Because this would involve the admission of what is not supported* The term 'supported stands for not compatible with

* Some persons die in the womb some as soon as they are born and so forth. If death were not the effect of a specific cause it should be either eternal like *Ākāśa*, or an absolute non entity like the sky lotus —*Tātparyā*

† This Sūtra though not found in Sūtra Nis C is found everywhere else

§ The *Tātparyā* construes the Sūtra thus —*Pramāṇena avijayīkṛtam akṛtam —pratyuta pratyakṣāgamatiruddham —tasya 'abhyāgamāḥ abhyūpa gomaḥ tatpratīkṣāt* This is the interpretation that has been adopted in the translation, as also a second interpretation (B), put forward in the *Bhāṣya*

any right Cognition, the '*abhyāgama*' of that means its acceptance, avowal, the meaning thus is that he who believes what has been said (in Sū 71) would be avowing what is incompatible with all right notion. Hence the instance cited cannot be right, since what is asserted is neither perceptible, nor cognisable by inference. Thus what the *Sūtra* (72) urges is the fact that what has been cited by the Opponent is something *still to be proved*.

(B) Or, the *Sūtra* may be explained to mean that—*That cannot be, as this would involve the accruing of what is not earned*. A person who, on the basis of the example of the Dark Colour of the Atom, seeks to support the view that the formation of the Body is not due to Destiny, draws upon himself the incongruity of the accruing of the unearned. That is, the theory would involve the contingency that pleasure and pain accrues to the man without his having done the acts leading up to that pleasure and pain. If, in answer to this, you say "yes, be it so",—then our answer is that this would be contrary (a) to Perception, (b) to Inference and (c) to Scripture.

(a) To perception it would be contrary in the following manner—That the Pleasure and Pain experienced by each individual Soul is distinct is a fact perceptible to all persons. "What is the distinction?" The distinctions are such as *strong and weak, belated and quick, diverse and uniform*, and so forth. (Under the Opponent's theory) there can be no speciality in the causes bringing pleasure and pain to each individual Soul separately, and unless there is some speciality in the cause there can be none in the effect. If, on the other hand, the advent of pleasure and pain is due to Destiny,—inasmuch as it is possible (a) for the acts of diverse personalities to be strong or weak etc., (b) for their Karmic residuum to be correspondingly more or less potent, and (c) for their acts to be of diverse or uniform character,—it is only right that there should be a corresponding distinction in the Pleasure and Pain resulting from those acts. And since no such distinction in the cause would be possible on the theory of the Opponent, there should be no distinction in the resultant Pleasure and Pain—and this would be incompatible with (contrary to) a fact known by Perception.

(b) The Opponent's theory would be contrary to Inference in the following manner.—The distribution of Pleasure and Pain among persons is found to follow from the distribution of their qualities, e.g. when an intelligent person, having recognised a certain pleasure as brought about by a certain means, *desires* that pleasure, he makes an *effort* to obtain that means, and thereby obtains that pleasure; and he does not obtain it otherwise [i.e. if he does not put forth the said effort],—similarly, when a person, having recognised a certain pain as brought about by a certain means, *desires* to avoid that Pain, he makes an *effort* to avoid that means, and thereby avoids that pain, and not otherwise. Now in the case in question, we find that there are certain pleasures and pains that accrue to a person without any effort on his part [such for instance as the sufferings due to a mis-shaped body], and on the strength of the well known facts just mentioned, we *infer* that the distribution of these pleasures and pains also must be due to some other quality of the intelligent being (if not his direct *effort*) [and this other quality is *Merit-Demerit* constituting the person's *Destiny*]. This inference would be contradicted if the accruing of pleasure and pain were held to be not due to *Destiny*. The said 'other quality' (*Merit-Demerit*), being imperceptible, is called '*adrsta*' (Unseen Force, *Destiny*), and since the time of its fruition is not definitely fixed, it is regarded as *indefinite*,* while Apprehension and the other qualities of the Soul are perceptible and evanescent.

(c) The Opponent's theory would be contrary to Scripture in the following manner.—There are several Scriptures written by sages, containing the instructions imparted by those sages, in regard to the performance and avoidance of actions, and the effect of such instruction we find in the shape of activities of men consisting of performance in due accordance with their respective castes and conditions of life, as also in the shape of cessation from activity, consisting of avoidance of action. Both

* We have translated the reading *avyavasthitam* though to keep up the contrast with the 'evanescence' of Buddha spoken of in the next sentence, '*avyavasthitam*', permanent, 'lasting', would appear to be the better reading.

these kinds of action, good and evil, would be impossible, under the philosophy of the *Pūrvapakṣin*, so that this philosophy is contrary to the view (in consonance with Scriptures) that the accruing of pleasure and pain to persons is due to Destiny

Thus the conclusion is that the doctrine—that "the formation of the Body is not due to Destiny, and the accruing of Pleasure and Pain is not due to Destiny"—is clearly wrong and is maintained only by the worst sinners.

Thus ends the *Bhāṣya* on *Adhyāya III*

DISCOURSE IV
DAILY LESSON I
SECTION (1)
Sūtras 1—2

General Examination of Activity and Defect.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

After *Mind* it is the turn of *Activity* to be examined * All that has been said in course of the Examination of the *Body* as the receptacle of Merit and Demerit may be regarded as constituting the Examination of *Activity*,—this is what is asserted in the following *Sūtra*

* The Third Discourse has dealt with the first six of the twelve 'objects of cognition' mentioned in Su 1-1-9, these six—Soul, Body, Sense-organs, Things perceived, Apprehension and Mind—being the *causes* of the remaining six—Activity, Defect, Re birth, Fruition, Pain and Release, these are the *effects* of the former six [This is what constitutes the connection between Discourses III and IV.] In the First Daily Lesson we have the examination of the six 'objects'; and in the Second we have the Examination of the Highest Cognition, the Right Knowledge (that leads directly to Release) —*Parissuddhi*.

Vardhamāna adds—Another connection between the end of Adhyāya III and the beginning of Adhyāya IV, consists in the fact that among the Objects mentioned in Su 1 1-9, it is 'Activity' whose *mention* follows that of 'Mind', hence it is only natural that the 'examination' also of *Activity* should follow that of *Mind*

Vardhamāna raises a further question—According to the rule laid down by the *Bhāṣya*, the 'examination' of a subject must be preceded by its 'mention' and 'definition'; and as 'Right Knowledge' has nowhere been *mentioned*, there can be no justification for its *examination* in the second Daily Lesson of Adh IV. The answer is that 'Right Cognition' has been actually mentioned in Sū 1 1-1, where it is *mentioned* as leading to the Highest Good of Man, and further, to justify an 'examination', it is not necessary to directly *mention* a subject, for we find the *Sūtras* examining several subjects that are connected only remotely with the subjects *mentioned*. Another question that arises is—since Right Knowledge is the precursor of Release, it should have been dealt with beforehand. The answer to this is that a full account of Right Knowledge demands a previous account of the *objects* of that knowledge; it is for this reason that Right Knowledge has been dealt with *after* all other subjects have been dealt with

Sūtra 1

As Activity has been defined—so has it been examined*

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

It might be urged that after 'Activity', there should follow the Examination of 'Defects', hence the Sūtra adds—

Sūtra 2

So also have the Defects—

BHĀṢYA

been examined (A) Inasmuch as they subsist in the same substratum as Apprehension, Defects are regarded as the qualities of the Soul,—(B) inasmuch as they are the source of Activity and as they have the power of bringing about re-birth, they are regarded as the cause of 'Samsāra', 'Birth Rebirths',—and since this (series of births and re-births) is beginningless, Defects are regarded as operating† in a continuous series‡ *Wrong Knowledge* ceases when Right Knowledge is attained and on the cessation of *Wrong Knowledge*, the whole series of *Affections and Aversions* drop off; whereupon follows *Final Release*,—and from this it is clear that Defects (i.e., *Wrong Knowledge, Affec-*

* Activity has been defined under Sū 1-1-17 as the Operation of Speech, of Mind and of Body, and this may be regarded as its 'examination' also

These words—'so has it been examined'—are, according to the Bhāṣya, to be supplied to complete the Sūtra. Viśvanātha has taken exception to this—"It is not right to supply these words to the Sūtra for if this is done then the word 'tathā', 'so', required as the necessary correlation to 'yathā', 'as', of the Sūtra (1), having already been thus supplied there would be no syntactical connection between Sūtras (1) and (2). Hence the right way to construe is to take both Sūtras together, the meaning being—'just as Activity is as has been defined so is Defect also as it has been defined'."

This construction is perhaps better, but there is no point in the criticism of the Bhāṣya-interpretation, for there is nothing wrong in construing the single 'tathā' of Sū (1) with two 'tathā's—one supplied by the Bhāṣya and the other occurring in Sū (2).

† The right reading 'pratyakṣe' is supplied by Purāṇa M. B.

‡ Defects are due to the contemplation of desirable and undesirable things, hence like Apprehension they must be qualities of the Soul, being qualities of the soul they must proceed on lines similar to Activity, which is the product of the soul's quality, Effort. Hence the examination of 'Defects' becomes included in that of 'Activity'—Tātiparyā

tion etc) are liable to Appearance and Disappearance,—all this in connection with Defects has already been explained (under *Sūtras* 1-1-2 and 3-1-25)

End of Section (I)

SECTION (2) *

Sūtras 3-9

Defects divided into three Groups

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Question —It has been said in *Sū* 1-1-18 that 'Defects have inciting (causing activity) as their distinguishing feature', now the feelings of Pride, Jealousy, Envy, Suspicion, Selfishness and the like are all characterised by the said distinguishing feature, under the circumstances, why are not these enumerated by name ?

The answer to this is supplied by the following *Sūtra*

Sūtra 3

There are three Groups of Defects,—[all being included under] Desire, Hatred and Illusion, which are distinct from one another

BHĀṢYA

Of Defects there are three groups, three types, (I) *The Desire-type*—under which are included Love (for the other sex), Selfishness, Longing for acquiring, in a lawful manner, what belongs to another, Hankering (for Rebirth) and Greed (desire for obtaining, in an unlawful manner, what belongs to another),—(II) *The Hatred-type*—under which are included Anger, Jealousy, Envy, Malice, and Resentment—(III) *The Illusion-type*—under which are included Error, Suspicion, Pride, and Negligence Thus,

* Vardhamāna remarks—*Sūtra* 2 having dealt with Defects it would appear reasonable to regard *Sūtra* 3 *et seq* as continuing the same section. So that the proper arrangement would be to put *Sū* (1) alone under Section I, dealing with 'Activity', and *Sūtras* 2 to 9 under Section II dealing with Defects. But to this arrangement there would be the objection that only one *Sūtra*, the first would form a 'Section' which is not right, as a 'Section' must consist of several *Sūtras*. Hence the best explanation is that under Section I we have the treatment of 'Defects' only in a general way, and that too, as a side issue as something connected with Activity, while under Section II we have the detailed treatment of 'Defects'.

since all defects are included under one or the other of these three groups, they are not described individually

Objection—"Since all have the same distinguishing feature (of causing activity), it is not right to divide them under three groups "

Answer —The division into three groups is certainly right, since 'Desire', 'Hatred' and 'Illusion' are distinct from one another [though all are causes of activity, yet each has a distinctive character of its own], e.g., 'Desire' is characterised by attachment, 'Hatred' is characterised by aversion (intolerance), and 'Illusion' is characterised by wrong notion, this fact is realised by every man in his own experience every conscious person knows when Love appears, when he has the feeling that 'the quality of Love has appeared in my Soul', he also recognises the absence of Love, when he has the feeling 'the quality of Love is not present in my Soul' and similarly with the other two. As for the feelings of Pride and the rest, these are all found to be included under one or other of these three groups and hence they have not been mentioned separately.

Sūtra 4

[Objection]—"What is asserted is not right, because all three have one and the same thing for their antithesis "

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

"Desire and the rest cannot be regarded as distinct from one another, —Why?—Because they have one and the same thing for their antithesis. all three have one and the same thing for their antithesis—viz that which is known under the names 'tattvajñānam', 'knowledge of truth', 'samyanmatih' 'right knowledge', 'āryaprajñā', 'truthful cognition', 'sambodhah', 'right apprehension' "

Sūtra 5

[Answer]—The reason put forward is not valid, as there is no invariable concomitance

BHĀṢYA

The Dark Colour and several such properties of Clay have the same antithesis in the form of 'fire-contact', and there are other qualities of it, which, being brought about by baking, have one and the same source, —

Sūtra 6

of these, Illusion is the worser evil, each of these three being distinct,—as for one who is not under Illusion the others do not appear

BHĀṢYA

Illusion is an evil, it is spoken of as the 'worser evil', by taking the three two at a time * "Why is Illusion the 'worser evil'?" *Because for one who is not under illusion the others do not appear*,—i.e. unless one is affected by Illusion, Desire and Hatred do not appear, and when a man has become influenced by Illusion, one or the other (of the other two) appear in accordance with the man's notions,† when the man's impressions in regard to a thing are attractive (such as create attachment), they produce in him *Desire* (for that thing), while when his notions are repulsive (such as create aversion), they produce *Hatred*. Both these notions are nothing other than 'Illusion', which consists of *wrong notion*. Thus it is that Desire and Hatred have their source in Illusion. When Illusion is destroyed by Right Knowledge, both Desire and Hatred cease to appear, this is what accounts for their having one and the same thing for their antithesis. It is with a view to these facts that it has been explained under Su 1 1 2 that, *after True Knowledge 'there is a cessation of each member of the following series—Pain, Birth, Activity, Defect, and Wrong Notion,—the cessation of that which follows bringing the annihilation of that which precedes it, and this ultimately leads to the Highest Good'*

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Objection —"If what is said in Su 6 is true, then there arises the following difficulty —

* Because the term '*pāpīyān*' is in the comparative degree it follows that what is meant is that as between Illusion and Desire and Illusion and Hatred Illusion is the worser evil

† What is spoken of '*Saṅkalpa* Notions' is the remembrance, under Illusion of a certain thing as bringing pleasure and that of another thing as bringing pain—*Tatparyā*

Sūtra 7

'Inasmuch as (between Illusion and the other two) there is the relation of cause and effect, it follows that 'Illusion' is something different from the 'Defects'

BHĀṢYA

"The effect is always different from the cause hence if Illusion is the cause of the Defects (Desire and Hatred), it cannot itself be a 'Defect' "

Sūtra 8

[Answer]—That is not so, as Illusion is included under the definition of 'Defects'

BHĀṢYA

Defects having been defined as *those that have 'causing activity' for their distinguishing feature*—Illusion becomes included by this definition, under 'Defect'

Sūtra 9

Further, since it is quite possible for things belonging to the same class to bear among themselves the relation of cause and effect, the objection (in Sū 7) has no force

BHĀṢYA

Among substances, as well as qualities, belonging to the same class, it is found that they bear to one another various kinds of causal relation

End of Section (2)

SECTION (3)

Sūtra 10-31

Examination of 'Rebirth'

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

After 'Defects' comes 'Rebirth' * In regard to this the following objection is raised —"There can be no such thing as

* The doubt in regard to 'Rebirth' is as to its belonging to the Soul or to Apprehension or to the Body—says the *Tātparyā*. To this form of Doubt, the objection is raised in *Yardhamāna's 'Prakāśa'* that it having been already determined under Sū 1 1 19 that Rebirth is of the Soul there can be no room for such a doubt. The answer given is that from the definition provided under Sū 1 1-19 'Rebirth' appears to consist in death and birth; hence the further question naturally arises—How can death and birth

Rebirth, as the Soul is eternal and no eternal thing is ever found to be born or to die so that the Soul being eternal, there is no possibility of *Birth and Death* and yet it is only these two that constitute 'Rebirth' ?**

On this point we have the following statement of the established conclusion —

Sūtra 10

Rebirth is possible only because the Soul is eternal

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, it is the *eternal* Soul that 'departs' (*praiṣi*),—i.e. abandons the former body, dies,—and having 'departed' (*pretiṣa*), i.e., having abandoned the former body, 'comes' (*bhavaṣi*)—i.e. is born, takes up another body, and it is these two (*departing—coming*) that have been spoken of as 'Rebirth', '*Pretiṣa-bhāva*', under the Sūtra—'Rebirth consists in being born again' (Su. 1-1-19), so that what is meant (by Rebirth 'belonging to the Soul') is that *it abandons the previous body and takes up another*, and this is possible only when the Soul is eternal. On the other hand, he, for whom 'Rebirth' consists of the 'birth of one entity and destruction of another entity', would be faced with the absurdity that one entity would be deprived of the fruits of his deeds, while another would be saddled with the fruits of acts not done by him† And further, under

belong to the *Soul*, which being eternal cannot die or be born? And the most fitting occasion for dealing with this question is that when the 'examination of Rebirth' is taken up. Vardhamāna also suggests another answer as offered by 'others'.—The *Purvaśākhin* imposes upon the *Naiyāyika* the view that 'Rebirth consists of 'destruction and production' and then raises the doubt and the objection against the view that Rebirth belongs to the Soul and instead of urging the objection in this form the *Purvaśākhin* (in the *Bhāṣya*) starts off with the *Naiyāyika* view that Rebirth is something belonging to the Soul and then goes on to say that such Rebirth is not possible as it is not possible for any such thing to belong to the Soul.

* Thus 'Rebirth' is impossible under the theory of the *Naiyāyika* though it is quite compatible with the theory of the *Bauddha*, according to whom all these are evanescent undergoing destruction every moment.

† The entity that does the act is destroyed immediately afterwards, the entity that is subsequently born, at the time when the fruit of the said act appears is a totally different being so that while the latter is saddled

the theory that there are causes bringing about destruction (of the Being in the body), the teachings of the sages would be entirely useless [as the Being to whom the teachings are imparted cannot live long enough to profit by them] *

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Question—"In what manner does the production of things come about?"†

Sūtra 11

[*Answer*]-The (production) of perceptible‡ things is from perceptible§ things, as is clearly proved by Perception

The question being—"in what manner, and from what sort of material cause is the perceptible thing, such as the Body, produced?"—the answer is that, '*from perceptible things*', known as 'material substances'—i.e. from Earth and the other material substances, in their extremely subtle eternal forms—is produced the '*perceptible thing*', i.e. the ordinarily known Substances (Earth etc. in their gross form), which appear in the form of the Body, the Sense organs, the Objects and their appurtenances

with the fruit of the acts not done by him, the former becomes deprived of the fruit of those acts done by himself. Under the view that the eternal Soul is re-born, it is the same Soul that does the act and experiences its effects

* According to the Nāyāyika, on the other hand the real Being, Soul being everlasting, persists from life to life and its birth and death consist respectively, in its becoming connected, and disconnected with a Body a set of Sense organs, Intellect and Sensation

† It is not easy to perceive the connection of this question with 'Rebirth', the subject matter of the Section. The production questioned about now, is the coming into existence of material objects and the only connection possible would be that, the Bhāṣya having declared that 'Rebirth' does not consist of 'destruction and production', it becomes necessary to determine the exact nature of production, and then to show that it is not possible for the non-material substance Soul, and hence in the term '*pratyakḥāra*', 'Rebirth', '*bhāra*', 'birth' cannot mean 'production'

Viśvanātha takes it as introduced for the purpose of bringing forward the various theories in regard to the 'production' of the Body.

‡ The term '*vyākṛta*' stands, according to the Tārika, for that which is endowed with the conditions of perceptibility, i.e. anything endowed with such perceptible qualities as Colour and the rest. Hence the word '*vyākṛtāḥ*' takes in the Atoms also, which are endowed with the qualities of Colour etc.

The term 'vyakta', 'perceptible', stands for what is cognisable by means of the Sense-organs, and by reason of similarity to this 'perceptible' thing, its cause also is called 'vyakṭa', 'perceptible'

"What is the similarity?"

The similarity (between the perceptible thing and its cause) consists in the presence of Colour and other qualities. Hence the meaning of the Sutra is that—'out of the eternal substances, Earth etc., which are endowed with the qualities of Colour etc., are produced the Body and such other things, which are endowed with the qualities of Colour etc.'

[That this is so] is clearly proved by Perception. We actually see that out of such substances as Clay and the like which are endowed with the qualities of Colour and the rest, are produced objects of the same kind (i.e., possessed of the qualities of Colour etc.),—and from this fact (perceived in connection with visible Objects) we infer the same in connection with invisible things also, that is, in the case of the Clay etc., we find that the presence of Colour and other qualities is common to the material cause as well as its product and from this we deduce the same in regard to the causal nature of the eternal super-sensuous things (Atoms) also

Sūtra 12

[Objection]—"What is asserted is not true, as the Jar is not produced out of the Jar"

BHĀṢYA

"This also is a perceptible fact that the 'perceptible' Jar is never found to be produced out of the 'perceptible' Jar, hence as we do not see the perceptible thing being produced out of the 'perceptible' thing it follows that the cause (of the production) of the 'perceptible' (Body etc.) is not a 'perceptible' thing"

Sūtra 13

[Answer]—Inasmuch as the Jar is actually produced out of a 'perceptible' substance the objection has no force

BHĀṢYA

We do not say that everything is the cause of everything, what we do say is that whatever 'perceptible' thing is produced, it is produced out of a similar (i.e., perceptible) thing, and the

substance Clay, which is called 'potsherd', out of which the Jar is produced, is 'perceptible'. One who would deny such a patent fact could never be argued with by any person

The truth of the matter is as we have described

End of Section (3)

SECTION (4)

Sūtra 14—18

Examination of the Theory that the Things of the World are produced out of the Void.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

We now proceed to show up the views of philosophers (of several schools)—*

Sūtra 14

"Entities are produced out of Negation, as no object comes into existence without having destroyed (its cause)."

BHĀṢYA

"One theory is that the *entity* is produced out of *negation*, — Why?—Because things are produced only after having destroyed (something), e g the sprout is produced only after the seed has been destroyed, and not till the seed is destroyed. If the 'destruction of the seed' were not the cause of the sprout, then it would be possible for the sprout to come into existence even without destroying the seed"†

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The answer to the above is given in the following Sūtra —

* The *Parisuddhi* calls Sections 4-11 '*Aupadghaika*', 'Introductory', or (more correctly) 'Supplementary', to the Section putting forward the theory that 'perceptible things are produced out of perceptible things'

It is interesting to note that the purely theistic doctrine of God having created the world has been put by Gautama among these 'views' held apparently by other people. It is in view of this that the *Vartika* has remarked that the Author of the Sūtra has put forward these various views of doctrines here, — 'some of these are set forth for being criticised, and others are put up as accepted'. The *Tātparyā*, the *Parisuddhi* and the *Prakāśa* however do not admit this view (See below, Note on Sec. 5)

† Whenever an object is produced, its production is always preceded by the destruction of its material cause. Hence every object has for its cause this *Destruction*, and *Destruction* is a form of *negation*

Sūtra 15

The reasoning put forward is unsound, as it involves self-contradiction.

BHĀṢYA

The premiss—'because there is no production without destruction'—is unsound, as it involves self-contradiction. That which *destroys* (the cause) cannot be said to come into existence *after that destruction*, since it must have been already in existence [in order to be able to destroy the cause, that which is itself non-existent cannot destroy anything],—and that which comes into existence (*after destruction* of the cause) was not in existence before, and being non-existent, it could not destroy the cause [consequently the assertion that 'the thing comes into existence after destroying the cause' is self-contradictory]

Sūtra 16

[Not comprehending the purport of the Siddhāntin's argument, in Sū 15 the Nihilist says]—

"What has been urged is not right; for, as a matter of fact, words denoting the case-relations are applied to past as well as future things."

BHĀṢYA

[Says the Opponent]—"As a matter of fact words denoting the case relations are used in regard to past as well as future things, e.g. 'the son shall be born', [where the *future* son is in the *Nominative case*],—'he rejoices at the son to be born', [where the *future* son is in the *Accusative Case*],—'he appoints the name of the son to be born' [where the *future* son is in the *Genitive case*],—'the Jar existed' [where the *past* Jar is in the *Nominative case*],—'he is sorry for the broken Jar' [where the *past* Jar is in the *Accusative case*],—'these postherds are of the broken Jar' [where the *past* Jar is in the *Genitive case*].—Sons, not being born, are a source of anxiety, to the old Father,* [where the *future* son is in the *Nominative case*],—we find several instances of such secondary (figurative) usage. 'What is the primary basis of this secondary usage?' Immediate sequence is the primary basis—and on this basis of 'immediate sequence', what the ex-

* The *Vartika* reads स्थविर which gives better sense

pression 'comes into existence after having destroyed' means is that 'when going to come into existence, the sprout destroys the seed', and the Nominative character (of the Sprout, not yet born) is purely secondary (or figurative) "

Sūtra 17

[Answer].—[Even so] the view put forth cannot be accepted; because as a matter of fact there is no production out of things destroyed.

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, the Sprout is *not* produced out of the destroyed seed. Hence it is not true that "Entities are produced out of negation" (as alleged in Sū 14) *

Sūtra 18

In so far as 'Sequence' is mentioned,—this we do not deny.

BHĀṢYA

The fact that the 'coming into existence' (of the sprout) is preceded by the 'destruction' (of the seed) constitutes their 'sequence', and in so far as this 'sequence' has been put forward (by the Opponent) as the reason (probans) for the proposition that "Entities are produced out of negation",—this 'sequence' we do not deny, all that we mean is that, when the composition of the particles becomes disturbed, the previous combination ceases and another combination takes its place, and it is out of this latter combination,—and not out of *negation*—that the next substance is produced. What happens is that the component particles of the Seed have aroused within them a certain vibration by reason of some (unknown) cause,—whereupon they abandon their previous combination and take upon another, and it is from this latter combination that the sprout is produced, in fact

* If the 'destruction of the seed were the cause of the birth of the sprout,—then, how is it that we find no sprout appearing when the seed is broken up into pieces by the hammer, and the disrupted component pieces do not form another composite? And how is it that the sprout appears only when the disruption of the seed is followed by a fresh composite formed out of its disjointed component pieces? These facts clearly show that the birth of the sprout does not arise out of the 'destruction' of the seed
—*Tatparya*

we actually see that the 'particles of the seed' and their 'composition' constitute the causes of the production of the Sprout, and unless the previous combination has been *destroyed*, it is not possible for another combination to come into existence,—this is all that constitutes the 'sequence' between 'Destruction' and 'coming into existence';—but this cannot prove that "Entities are produced out of Negation" (as alleged by the *Pūroapaksin*) And inasmuch as, for the production of the sprout there is no other cause except the component particles of the seed, it is only right that the seed should be admitted as the cause of the Sprout *

End of Section 4

SECTION (5)

Sūtras 19-21

Examination of the Theory that God is the Cause of the Universe.†

* Because, says the *Tātparyā*, unless the seed is there, the component particles of the seed cannot be there

† In regard to this *Section* there is a difference among Commentators. According to the *Bhāṣya*, the *Vartika* and *Viśvanātha*, it is meant to propound the *Naiyāyika Siddhānta* that the Universe has been created by God, and in accordance with this view, *Sū* 19 puts forward the final *Siddhānta*. *Sū* 20 puts forward an objection against the *Siddhānta* and *Sū* 21 answers that objection from the stand point of the *Siddhānta*. It is this interpretation that we have adopted in the translation.

In view, perhaps, of the fact that such an interpretation of the *Section* is inconsistent with the introductory assertion of the previous *Bhāṣya*—'we now proceed to show up the views of philosophers,—the *Tātparyā*, followed by the *Parasuddhis* and *Prakāśa*, has taken it as representing the criticism of the *Vedānta* doctrine that "God is the *constituent* cause of the Universe." By this interpretation *Sū* 19 represents the *Vedānta* view, *Sū* 20 shows the untenability of that view, and *Sū* 21 puts forward the final *Nyāya-Siddhānta* that God is the *creator*, the *operative* cause, *not* the *constituent* cause, of the Universe

There is also a wider issue involved in this *Section*. The Commentators are agreed that the *Siddhānta* view here put forward is that God is the Creator of the Universe. Now the question arises—How is it that this cardinal doctrine of the system has been inserted by Gautama as a side-issue? He has put it forward only among "certain philosophical doctrines", and not as the *true doctrine*. Nor is it easy to reconcile the doctrine of God being the *Creator* with the view that there is no such thing as 'beginning of

Another philosopher says—

Sūtra 19

God is the cause, because we find fruitlessness in the actions of Men

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, we find that Man, desiring a certain thing, does not always obtain the fruit of his desire, hence it is inferred that Man's acquisition of the fruits of his actions is dependent upon some other person, and that Person upon whom it is dependent is *God*, hence it follows that *God* is the Cause (of the World) *

Sūtra 20

[*Objection*]—"It is not so; because as a matter of fact, no fruit appears without man's action "

Creation—as is often found reiterated by the *Vartika* (e.g. on P. 445 and P. 466 Bib. Ind. Ed.) if there is no beginning, *God* may be the *Controller*, the *Ruler*, He cannot be the *Creator*. From the *Bhāṣya* also (under Su. 21) it seems that *God* is held to be only the *Seer* *Knower* *Omniscient*, *All powerful*.

* According to the *Taitparyā* this *Sūtra* presents the *Vedānta* view that *God* is the constituent cause of the world. the *Parīśuddhi* remarks that though the *Sūtra* has used the general term 'cause', yet it is clear from the context that the constituent cause is meant. *Vardhamāna*—"From this *Purvapakṣa* *Sūtra* it is clear that the purpose of the Section is to refute the *Vedānta* theory." In support of this view is also the fact that the preceding section also has dealt with the question of the constituent cause of the world.

The *Vedānta* doctrine is thus stated by the *Taitparyā*—"The phenomenal world may not have come out of the Void it can certainly be produced out of *Brahman*, which becomes modified into the several names and forms [i.e. objects and their qualities says *Vardhamāna*], exactly in the same manner as the clay is modified into the Jar etc. or (according to other *Vedāntins*) *Brahman*, through the limitations cast by the beginningless *Nescience* appears in the form of the several phenomenal substances, just as the face appears in several forms, through the limitations of the substances in which it becomes reflected. It is this *Brahman* that is meant by the term '*Īśvara*', in the *Sūtra* this term connoting the powers of reflection and action both of which are present in *Brahman* alone, and not in *Negation* or in *Primordial Matter* or in *Atom*. Man himself does not possess these powers. But if Man were the ordainer of the World and had the necessary properties of omniscience and omnipotence, then he could never undertake an action that would turn out to be futile, fruitless. And inasmuch as we do find the actions of Men turning out fruitless we conclude that *God*—i.e. *Brahman*—is the Cause of the World. Su. (19)

BHĀṢYA

[*Objection*] —“ If the appearance of fruits (of actions) were dependent upon God (entirely), then such fruits could be accomplished even without the desire (and action) of man ”

Sūtra 21

[*Answer*].—Inasmuch as it is influenced by Him there is no force in the reason (put forward) †

* According to the *Bhāṣya* this Sūtra is an objection urged by the Pūrvapakṣin, against the Nyāya doctrine stated in Su 19. According to the *Tatparya*, it is an objection urged by the *Siddhāntin Naiyāyika* against the Vedānta doctrine stated in Su 19. In pursuance of this interpretation the *Tatparya* introduces this Su 20 as follows —It puts forth arguments against the Vedānta theory of things evolving or modifying out of Brahman, and concludes with the assertion that it is not right to hold that Brahman evolves or modifies into the endless phenomenal substances and as such is the *constituent cause* of things —though it may be that Brahman or God is the *operative cause* of things —and then it goes on to say that in connection with the view that God is the *operative cause* of things it might be held that in creating the world God is not influenced by any other force —and it is with a view to guard against this view that we have Sū 20, which shows that *God is influenced by the actions of men*.

It may be noted that the roundabout manner in which the *Tatparya* has got to fit in the Sūtra to its own interpretation shows that it is perhaps not what the *Sūtras* really mean; that is the *Sūtras* have no bearing upon the Vedānta theory at all.

† The *Tatparya* in pursuance of its own interpretation remarks —‘Having rejected the two theories—(1) that the World is evolved out of Brahman and (2) that God independent of all other forces is the Creator of the world —the author of the *Sūtra* now puts forward his own final *Siddhānta*.

According to the *Bhāṣya* this Sūtra is only the Naiyāyika’s answer to the objection urged in Sū 20 —the sense being that— inasmuch as Man’s efforts are influenced by God what has been urged in Su 20 against the view that God is the *operative cause* of the world is not a valid reason.

The *Nyāya-Siddhānta* is thus expounded by the *Tatparya* —The World has the Atoms for its *constituent cause* and its *operative cause* is God as influenced by Men’s acts and these acts also have God for their *operative cause* nor is there any incongruity in this since even though the carpenter is helped and influenced by the axe yet the axe also is made by him. The reason put forward in Sū 20 has no force against the view that the world is the work of God as helped by Men’s acts though it is an effective argument against the view that in creating the world, God does not require the help of anything outside Himself.

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, God helps the effort of Man, i.e., when Man is trying to obtain a particular fruit, it is God that accomplishes that fruit for him, when God does not accomplish it, Man's action becomes fruitless,—hence since things are thus influenced by God, what has been urged to the effect that—“because as a matter of fact no fruit appears without man's action”—is no reason at all

[The question now arises—What is God? The *Bhāṣya* proceeds to answer this question]—God is a distinct Soul endowed with certain qualities, as a Being of the same kind as 'Soul'. He cannot be put under any other category, hence God is defined as a particular Soul endowed with such qualities as—(1) absence of demerit, wrong knowledge and negligence, and (2) presence of merit, knowledge and intuitiveness and to Him also belongs, the eight fold 'Power'—consisting of 'minuteness' and the rest—as the result of His Merit and Knowledge,—His 'Merit' follows the bent of his Volition—He controls the operation of the accumulated Merit Demerit subsisting in each individual Soul, as also that of the Earth and other material substances and He is Omnipotent in regard to His creation, not however, failing to be influenced by the results of acts done by the beings He creates

He has obtained* all the results of His deeds [and continues to act for the sake of His created beings, because] just as the father acts for His children so does God also act father-like for His creatures. There is no other category except the category of 'Soul' to which God could belong, for (as in the case of Soul so) in the case of God, no other property, save *Buddhi*, Consciousness, can be pointed out as being indicative of His existence† From scriptures also we

* Puri Ms B reads आत्मवर्णित instead of आत्मरूप, which latter is the reading adopted by the *Tatparjā* and in our text this latter also explains आत्मरूप as स्वभावात्मकलक्षण, so that the sense remains the same under both readings

† Though God differs from other Souls in the point of His Cognition etc. being eternal, while those of others are evanescent yet He must be classed under the same category, since like other Souls, He also is indicated by *Buddhi* etc

learn that God is the 'Seer, the Cogniser and omniscient'. If God were not discernible by the presence of Consciousness and such other indicatives of the 'Soul', then, as He is beyond the reach of ordinary Perception, Inference and Words, how could His existence be described and proved by anyone?

Lastly, if God acted irrespectively of the effects of acts done by the beings created by Him, then, this view would become open to all those objections that have been urged against the view that "the creation is not due to the acts of Souls". [*Vide*, end of I Daily Lesson, Adhyāya III]

End of Section (5)

SECTION (6)

(Sūtras 22-24)

Examination of the View that the World is the result of Chance.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Another philosopher asserts as follows —

Sūtra 22

"The production of entities must be without an *operative cause*, as we see such things as the sharpness of the thorn and the like "

BHĀṢYA

"The Body and such other entities must be regarded as produced without an *operative cause*, since we see such things as the sharpness of the thorn and the like, such things as the sharpness of the thorn, the variegated colour of the minerals found in mountainous regions, the smoothness of stones and so forth are found to be produced without any *operative cause*, and yet each of them has a constituent cause,* the same must be the case with the production of the Body etc, also "

* चोपादानं of the *Vāz* text gives no sense, the right reading is चोपादानवच्च, which is countenanced by the *Varṭika* and is found in the *Purī* Ms B

It is clear that what the *Purvapakṣin* denies in the present Sūtra is the Nyāya theory of God being the *operative cause* of the world the Sūtra distinctly mentions the '*mimitta*', and the *Bhāṣya* makes it still clearer by

Sūtra 23

[The Ekadeśin's answer to the *Pūrvapakṣa*]

Since the non-cause is (spoken of as) the 'cause', the said production of entities is not 'without cause'.

BHĀṢYA

[Some Naiyāyikas have offered this as an answer to the *Pūrvapakṣa* view expressed in Sū 22] It is alleged (in Sū 22) that '*bhāvotpatti*', the 'production of entities', is '*animittatah*', [and since this latter term ends in an affix which has the sense of the Ablative, it can only mean that the production proceeds from '*animitta*', 'non cause'], and that from which a thing proceeds is its 'cause', so that since (from what is said in Sū 22 it is clear that) the '*animitta*', 'non-cause', is the cause of the 'production of entities', it follows that the said 'production' is not 'without cause' (as is alleged by the *Pūrvapakṣin*)

Sūtra 24

'*Nimitta*' (Cause) and '*Animitta*' ('Non cause') being two distinct things, the answer (offered in Sū 23) is no answer at all.

BHĀṢYA

'*Nimitta*' Cause is one thing, and its negation (*animitta*) ('Non cause') is another, and the negation cannot be the same as the negated, e g when it is said that 'the vessel is without water', this denial of water is not the same as water [So that

saying that the things mentioned—the sharpness of the thorn etc.—have a constituent cause and yet they have no operative cause. Thus explained, the present section becomes connected naturally with the foregoing section dealing with God as the operative cause of the world. In their anxiety to connect this section with what they consider the principal subject of the *Adhyaya*—the constituent cause of the world—the commentators have needlessly confused the issues involved. E.g., the *Parasaddhā* says—'The *Pūrvapakṣin* proceeds to criticise the *Siddhānta* position (put forward under Sū 4 1 II) that perceptible things are produced out of perceptible causes and for demolishing this view he begins with the demolition of the operative cause— and *Yādhamaṇa* adds that in reality the *Pūrvapakṣin*'s standpoint is to deny all kind of cause of the world. *Viṣvanātha* also says—"If things are due to mere chance then Atoms cannot be the constituent cause nor God the operative cause of the World [hence the *Pūrvapakṣin* insists upon the Chance theory and the *Siddhāntin* controverts it]

there is no point in saying, as the *Ekadeśin* has said in Sū. 23, that the 'animita', 'non-cause', is the 'nimitta', 'cause', of production.]

[The real answer to the *Pūroapaksa* put forward in Su 22 is that] the view therein put forward in no way differs from the view that 'the origination of the Body etc is not due to the actions of men', and being identical with this view, it must be taken as refuted by the refutation of that view, (under Sūtras 3 2 60-72)

End of Section (6)

SECTION (7)

(Sūtras 25-28)

Examination of the view that All Things are evanescent

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Other philosophers have held the following view —

Sūtra 25

"All things must be evanescent, because they are liable to be produced and destroyed" *

"What is the meaning of being 'evanescent'? That which exists only for some time is called 'evanescent' That which is

* The causes, out of which the things of the world are produced,—do they consist of all evanescent things, or of all eternal things, or of some eternal and some evanescent things? This is what is going to be considered now. If the first two alternatives are true, then there can be no 'Rebirth', such as the *Naiyāyika* postulates. Hence it becomes necessary to refute them, and the present Section proceeds to refute the first of the three alternatives. The position controverted here is not the same as that in which all things are held to be momentary, because the *Pūroapaksa* here admits some sort of continuity of existence of things and as such differs from the thorough going *Kṣanabhaṅgavādin* Nihilist—*Parīśuddhi*

Vardhamāna in view of what he has said in connection with the preceding Section says—'Though what has been proved in the foregoing Section is that the things of the world have an operative cause yet what the present Section takes up is the question of eternity or evanescence of all three kinds of cause because in a general way what has been said in proof of the operative cause is applicable to the constituent and non constituent causes also. The precise Doubt or question to be dealt with in the present Section is—whether or not cognisability is invariably concomitant with evanescence

Viśvanātha says—If all things are evanescent the Soul also should be evanescent, hence it becomes necessary to controvert that view

liable to be produced is non-existent while it is not produced, and that which is liable to be destroyed is non-existent when it has been destroyed,* and what this means is that all material things—such as the Body etc.—and all non-material things—Cognition and the rest—both kinds of things are found to be liable to production and destruction, from which it follows that they are all evanescent."

Sūtra 26

[The Ekadeśin's answer to the Pūrvapakṣa]—What is asserted cannot be true, as the 'evanescence' itself is eternal
BHĀṢYA

If the *evanescence* of all things is everlasting (eternal), then, by reason of the *eternality* of that 'evanescence', it cannot be true that 'all things are evanescent',—if, on the other hand, the said 'evanescence' is not ever-lasting, then while the 'evanescence' would be non-existent, all things would be *eternal*!

Sūtra 27

[The Siddhāntin's objection to the Ekadeśin's argument in Sū 26]

As a matter of fact, the 'evanescence' is not eternal, it is like the destruction of fire after having destroyed the thing burnt by it

BHĀṢYA

The said 'evanescence' is not eternal. "How so?" Just as Fire, after having destroyed the thing burnt by it becomes itself destroyed (extinguished), similarly the 'evanescence of all things', after having destroyed all things, becomes itself destroyed [So that there need be no incongruity in regarding the 'evanescence' as 'non-eternal']

* The *Pāṇ* edition reads च विनष्टः; the *Parāṣa* (Bib. Ind. edition) and the *Tatparya* read च विनष्ट, we have adopted the latter, as being more in keeping with the sense of the sentence as a whole. With the former reading the sentence would mean—'that which is liable to be destroyed is never not destroyed.' Though this will give some sort of sense, yet it would not be in keeping with the rest of the passage. The *Tatparya* construes the *Bhāṣya* to mean—'things are non-existent after destruction, hence liability to production and destruction proves that things exist only for some time, that is, they are evanescent.'

Sūtra 28

[The Final Siddhānta]

The Eternal cannot be rightly denied, because the determination (as to a certain thing being eternal or evanescent must be in accordance with what is actually perceived

BHĀṢYA

The theory propounded (in Sū 25) totally denies all 'eternality', but the total denial of 'eternality' is not right —Why?— *Because the determination must be in accordance with what is actually perceived* That is, when a certain thing is rightly found to be 'liable to be produced and destroyed', it should be regarded as *evanescent*,—and when a thing is found to be *not* so liable, it must be the reverse, and as a matter of fact, the said *liability to be produced and destroyed* is not perceived by any means of right knowledge, in such things as the elemental substances in their subtle forms, Ākāśa, Time, Space, Soul and Mind,—and some qualities of these,—Community, Individuality and Inherence,—hence the conclusion is that all these are eternal

End of Section (7)

SECTION (8)

(Sūtras 29–33)

Examination of the Theory that All Things are Eternal.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Here is another sweeping assertion —

Sūtra 29

[Pūrvapakṣa] —“All things must be eternal, because the five elemental substances are eternal”

BHĀṢYA

“All this, everything in the world, is an elemental substance, and elemental substances are eternal, the total destruction of any elemental substance being impossible (according to the Naiyāyika himself) [everything must be eternal]”

* If all things are eternal there can be no Re birth, as Re birth presupposes the destruction of the Body Hence it is necessary to controvert this view

Sūtra 30

What has been asserted cannot be right, 'as we actually perceive the cause of production and of destruction

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, we actually perceive the cause of the production (of things), as well as the cause of (their) destruction, and this would be incompatible with the view that all things are eternal *

Sūtra 31

[Objection]—"Inasmuch as all things possess the characteristics of elemental substances, the denial (in *Sū* 30) is not right. '

BHĀṢYA

"The thing, of which you think you perceive the causes of production and destruction, is not found to be anything totally different from, and devoid of the characteristics of, Elemental Substances, and inasmuch as everything possesses the characteristics of Elemental Substances, it must be an Elemental Substance, so that the denial (in *Sū* 30) is not right "†

Sūtra 32

[Answer]—What has been urged can not be right, because as a matter of fact, the cause and production are actually perceived

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact (in the case of every ordinary thing, such as the Bull, the Jar and the like), the cause is actually perceived, as also the production of the thing possessing qualities analogous to the qualities of the cause, and neither of these can be possible in regard to an 'eternal' thing, nor is it possible to

* Things composed of elemental substances are not the same as the elemental substances themselves, the Bull and the Jar for instance are not the same as the subtle Atoms, for if they were so they would be as imperceptible as the Atoms are. And since we actually perceive the cause of production and destruction of such things as the Bull and the Jar, these cannot be eternal, even though the elemental substances may be so—

† Elemental substances are eternal,—the Bull and the Jar are not anything different from Elemental substances,—hence eternality cannot be denied of the Bull and the Jar. .

deny that there is such perception of the 'cause' and the 'production' (of the thing), nor again is it possible for a perception to be entirely devoid of a real objective basis, so that on the strength of this perception it is inferred that the product is *produced* (brought into existence) as possessing qualities analogous to those of its cause, and it is that product which forms the real objective basis for the said perception. This (the fact of products having qualities similar to those of their cause) accounts for the fact that "all things possess the characteristics of Elemental Substances" (that has been urged by the Opponent in Sū 31) *

Further, as a matter of fact, we find that the effort of the cognitive agent is put forth only when he is urged by a desire for the cause of the production (of what he wishes to obtain) and the destruction (of what he wishes to get rid of). [So that Man's effort also presupposes the *production* and *destruction* of things]

Thirdly, every composite substance is known to have that character, i.e., it is a well known fact that every composite substance has the character of being liable to production and destruction

Fourthly, what has been urged by the Opponent is not applicable to Sound, Motion, Cognition and such things, as a matter of fact, the two reasons put forward—(a) "because the five Elemental Substances are eternal" (Sū 29) and (b) "because everything is possessed of the characteristics of Elemental Substances" (Sū 31)—are not applicable to such things as Sound, Motion, Cognition, Pleasure, Pain, Desire, Aversion and Effort, [as not one of these is either an Elemental Substance, or possessed of the characteristics of elemental substances], hence the reason is '*anekānta*' i.e., inconclusive, because non-pervasive, too narrow)

[Says the Opponent]—"Like the cognition of things in a dream, the said perception (of the cause and of production) is wrong "

* The fact of the Bull and the Jar having the characteristics of Elemental Substances is due to their being the *products* of those substances and not to their being the same as those substances. Hence the said fact cannot prove the eternity of the Bull and the Jar.

The same may be said of the perception of Elemental Substances also. What you mean is that—'The perception of the production and the cause of things is of the same character as the cognition of things in a dream', but if that be so, then the same might be said also in regard to the perception of Elemental Substances, and the perception of Earth etc. also would have to be regarded as similar to the cognition of things in a dream [so that there would be no justification for regarding even the Elemental Substances as *eternal*!]

[The Opponent says]—"If there are no such things as the Earth etc., then the practical usages of men would come to an end."

The same would apply to the other case also, if there were no real objective basis for the perception of the production and the cause of things, then also all practical usages of men would come to an end.

Further, to argue that "the said perception (of production etc.) is as unreal as the cognition of things during dreams", is not a right argument at all [i.e., it cannot prove any such conclusion as the Opponent desires to prove, *viz.*, ordinary things like the Bull and the Jar are exactly like the Atoms of Elemental Substances],—(a) because Eternal Substances (Atoms) are beyond the reach of the senses (which the ordinary things of the world are not), and (b) because they are *not* objects of *production* and *destruction* (which the ordinary things of the world *are*).

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

"What really happens," says another philosopher, "is that the Original Substance remaining constant, one property of it ceases and another property is produced,—and this is what forms the object (meaning) of the 'destruction' and 'production' of the thing; in fact when a thing is said to be 'produced', it is something that has been already in existence (in the form of the original substance even before that 'production'); and similarly when a thing is said to be 'destroyed' it continues to exist (in the form of the Substance) even after that destruction [for all that has happened is that one property has disappeared

and another has appeared], and in this manner all things are eternal" *

[This doctrine is refuted in the following *Sūtra*] †

Sūtra 33

This cannot be accepted, for (under this theory) there would be no possibility of differentiation —

BHĀṢYA

There would be no possibility of any such differentiation as 'this is *birth*, and *that* is *cessation*', as under the theory put forward what is born and what has ceased to exist are both *extant* (A) [In regard to properties also] there could be no differentiation (as to Time) such as 'this property is born and that property has ceased', as both are equally *extant*, — (B) nor would there be any differentiation as to time, — such as 'at this time there are birth and cessation, and not at that time', for *at all times* things would be equally *extant*, (C) nor could there be any differentiation as to *relationship* such as 'there are birth and cessation of this property, and not of that', for both properties would be equally *extant*, (D) nor again, could there be any such differentiation in regard to *Time* as 'this, not yet come, is in the future and that is past', for under the theory all things are always *extant*, which means that they are always present [and as such can never be spoken of as 'future' or 'past']

None of these objections lie against the view (held by the *Naiyāyika*) that 'birth' (production) consists in the coming into existence (gaining its own nature) of what has not been in existence, and cessation (destruction) consists in the ceasing to exist

* The *Tātparya* calls this doctrine *Stayambhūtanammatam*, does it mean the *Sāita* system? The doctrine is thus summed up in the *Tātparya* — The modification undergone by Substances is of three kinds (1) modification of properties (2) modification of condition and (3) modification of age. E.g. (1) the original substance *Gold* in lump becomes modified into the ear ring, and here we have the modification of the property (shape) of the gold (2) when the ear ring is broken up and made into the bracelet we have the modification of condition i.e. the ear ring has renounced its *present* and reverted to the *past* condition and the bracelet has removed its *future* and reverted to the *present* condition, and (3) in the beginning the bracelet is new, young and in time it becomes *old*, so that here we have the modification of age [The original gold remains constant all the time]

(losing its own nature) of what has been in existence. For these reasons we conclude that it is not right to assert, as has been asserted by the Opponent (End of Bhāṣya on Sū 33), that—"a thing exists before it is born, and it exists also after it has been destroyed"

End of Section (8)

SECTION (9)

[Sūtras 34-36]

The Refutation of the View that all is Diversity, there is no Unity.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The following is another sweeping assertion (of the (Bauddhas) —

Sūtra 34

"All must be regarded as diverse, because the symbols (names) of things refer to diverse entities""

BHĀṢYA

"All must be regarded as diverse, there is no single entity — Why? — *Bhāvalakṣanaprthaktvāt*—says the Sūtra, the 'lakṣana'

* It has been established up to this point that all things are aggregates of—'the Quality and the Qualified, 'the negative and the positive, the intelligent and the non-intelligent', 'the eternal and the non eternal',— and it becomes necessary to refute the theory that there is no such thing as the 'aggregate whole'. This theory has been held in several forms—(1) the theory that there is no unity (refuted in Sū 34-36), (2) 'all is mere Void' (Sū 37-40), (3) 'there is only one thing, or 'there are only two things', and so forth, (Sū 41-43). All these have to be refuted, because—(1) if there is no unity, no one thing, then of what could there be an aggregate? (2) If nothing exists, and all is Void, then there can be no aggregate, and (3) similarly there can be no 'aggregate' under the theory of absolute Monism — *Paribuddhi*.

The doctrine put forward under this Sūtra (34) is thus explained in the *Tatparjya* — "All things must be diverse, distinct, because there is no such thing as 'substance', apart from colour etc., and colour etc., are distinct from one another; nor is there any such thing as 'composite' apart from the components, and these latter are distinct from one another." Such is the view of the *Sāmrāntikas* and the *Vādhyāyikas*.

Viśvanātha states the doctrine thus—"Such things as the Jar and the like must be regarded as distinct, even from themselves, because the odour, taste, etc., of these things, as also their component parts, are distinct from one another, and the 'Jar' is nothing apart from these latter"

or 'symbol' of the '*bhava*', 'entity', is that which distinguishes it, i.e. its name and the names refer to diverse entities, as a matter of fact, all 'names of things' denote combinations, e.g. the name 'Jar' is applied to the combination of 'odour, taste, colour and touch', (the qualities of the Jar), and also to the combination of the 'bottom, sides and neck' (the parts of the Jar) [and these are diverse, distinct from one another, and the Jar is nothing apart from these qualities and component parts] The 'Jar' has been mentioned only by way of illustration [the same holds good in regard to the names of all things]

Sutra 35

What is alleged cannot be accepted, because (as a matter of fact) several (kinds of) things go to make a single entity

BHĀṢYA

The compound '*anekalakṣaṇaīh*' should be treated as one that has the middle word eliminated, and as standing for '*anekarī dhalakṣaṇaīh*', 'several kinds of things' As a matter of fact it is the single entity (the composite substance, Jar) that comes into existence as related to Odour and other qualities, and to the Bottom and other components, in fact, the Substance is something different from its Qualities, and the Composite is something different from the Components both these facts have been already explained by us (under Su 2 2-33 *et seq*)

Further,—

Sutra 36

The denial cannot be right as the symbols (of things) are restricted in their application

BHĀṢYA

The denial—that 'there is no single entity'—cannot be right,—why?—for the very simple reason that 'the symbols of things are restricted in their application', as a matter of fact the 'symbol of entities,—i.e. the word that forms their name, is restricted in its application to single entities, as is clear from such expressions as 'I am touching that Jar which I saw before', 'I am seeing that which I touched before' Then again, as a matter of fact, we never perceive any mere 'group of atoms' as such, and these 'groups of atoms' (as composing the

(jar) being imperceptible (by reason of their extreme minuteness), that which is actually perceived must be a single entity (composed of those atoms).

(A) It has been subsequently urged by the Opponent that—"there can be no single entity, because all things are mere groups (of several things)",—but if there is no *single* thing, there can be no *group* of things. What the Opponent means is that—"there is no *single* entity as the names of things apply only to groups",—but the fact is that if there is no *single* thing, there can be no 'group', as the 'group' is nothing more than the conglomeration of several *single* things, so that the allegation—"There is no single entity etc"—involving a self contradiction, is most incongruous. That is, that (single entity) of which the denial has been alleged, (by the Opponent, on the basis of the premises), "because the names of things are applied to groups",—becomes admitted by the Opponent when he asserts that "the names of things are applied to groups", for the 'group' is only a collection of several *single* entities. (B) Further, in making the allegation—"because the names of things are applied to groups of things"—you admit the 'group', and then in the proposition, "there is no single entity" you deny each component of that 'group' [for each such component can only be a *single* entity] {and when each component is denied, the group also becomes denied *ipso facto*}. Thus then, the Opponent's allegation being beset with a twofold 'self-contradiction' (A & B), it must be rejected as a frivolous assertion.

End of Section (9)

SECTION (10)

[Sūtras 37-40]

The Refutation of the Theory that All is Mere Void.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The following is another sweeping assertion —

Sūtra 37

"All things must be non-entities, because all things are known to be mere negations of one another "

BHĀṢYA

All things must be regarded as non-entities, —why?—*because all things are known to be mere negations of one another* As a matter of fact, the Bull is 'non-existent in the form of 'Horse', and the Bull is only 'not-horse', similarly the Horse is 'non-existent' in the form the 'Bull', and the Horse in only 'not-bull', thus we find that the names of things ('Bull', 'Horse' etc) are concomitant (co substrate) with the notion of 'non existence' as also with *negation*; from which it follows that all things are *non-existent* or non entities ""

[The *Bhāṣya* offers its own answer to the Nihilistic doctrine put forward in the *Sūtra*—The assertion put forward cannot be right, because there is contradiction between (A) the two terms of the Proposition and (B) between the Proposition and the Statement of the Probans

(A) The term 'all' signifies *several things without exception*, while the term 'non entity' signifies the *negation of existence*, of these two the former is something possessed of a definite character, while the latter is totally devoid of any character; now

* This Nihilism is thus expounded in the *Tatparya* —'All things—Pramāṇa and the rest—are actually found to be cognised as 'non-existent' and also spoken of in negative terms, hence it follows that the names of those things are concomitant with these (the notion of non existence and negation), hence Pramāṇa and the rest must be regarded as non-existent, as nonentities just like the Cloth that has either not come into existence or has been destroyed Further are these things—Pramāṇa etc—eternal or evanescent? If they are eternal they must be non entities being without any capacity or power, as we have already explained how no sequence being possible among things that are eternal no eternal things can ever bring about a product If, on the other hand, the things are evanescent, then since they would be liable to destruction, they would be *non-existent* at the first as at the second moment Further, if things are *existent*, they should not be liable to destruction and as such they could not be destroyed at any point of time, for the blue Colour being brought about by its cause, can never be turned into yellow by even thousands of painters In fact evanescent things cannot but be regarded as liable to destruction From all this we conclude that all things are mere *Void, Blank*, and it is only through assumed *existence* that they appear as *existing* The reasoning may be formulated thus —"All names of things apply to non-existent things,—because they are concomitant with notions of *non existence* and *negation*,—like the unproduced and the destroyed Cloth "

how can that which is spoken of as possessed of definite character, i.e. 'all', be a mere 'non entity', which is devoid of any character? Certainly the 'non entity', which is totally devoid of any character, cannot be predicated either as 'several' or as 'without exception' [which are the two factors in the denotation of the term 'all']

"But it is just all this that is non-entity, what you (Logician) call the 'all' is what is really only non-entity"

Even so the 'contradiction' does not cease, for the conception of 'several things' and 'without exception' cannot possibly arise in regard to what is mere non-entity,* and yet it is just this conception that is expressed by the term 'all', hence it follows that this 'all' cannot be a non entity

(B) There is contradiction also between the Proposition and the Statement of the Probans, the Proposition is in the form 'all things are non-entities', and it denies the existence (of all things), and the statement of the Probans is 'because all things are known to be mere negations of one another',—which admits that there is 'mutual negation' among 'things', and then on the basis thereof—the fact of there being mutual negation having been established,—it is asserted that 'all things are non-entities',—now if 'all things are non entities', then it is not possible for 'things' to be the 'negation of one another', and if 'things' are 'negations of one another,' then 'all things' cannot be 'non-entities'

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The following is the answer (to Nihilism) offered by the *Sūtra*—

Sūtra 38

What has been alleged is not right, because things are, by virtue of their very nature, real entities

BHĀṢYA

(A) All things cannot be non-entities—Why?—Because by virtue of their very nature things are real entities (really existing) The proposition laid down is that *by their very nature*

* The right reading is अर्थाच्च प्रत्ययेन (as in the Puri Ms.) Construe thus अनेन विशेष्येति प्रत्ययेन अभावे न भवितुं शक्यम् ।

things exist "What is the nature of things?" 'Existence', 'being an entity', and so forth constitute the nature or character common to Substances, Qualities and Actions,—'having action' and so forth are the 'character' peculiar to Substances,—the qualities ending with Touch belong to Earth,—so on and so forth there are endless characters peculiar to the several things of the world,—in *Universal*, in *Individuality* and in *Inherence* also we find specific characters. All this distinction among things which is recognised in actual experience, would not be possible [if all things were mere non-entities], as a non-entity is without any character,—and yet such distinction among things does exist,—from which it follows that all things are not mere non-entities.

(B) [Another interpretation of the Sūtra]—Or, the words of the Sūtra may be taken to mean that—*what has been asserted cannot be right, because each thing is recognised as having a distinct individuality of its own*, that is to say, when the word 'Bull' is used, what is apprehended is a particular substance qualified by (belonging to) a particular community and not a mere non-entity. If all things were non-entities, the Bull would have been recognised as a 'non-entity', and the word 'Bull' would have denoted a non-entity. "But how do you know that the word 'Bull' does not signify a non-entity?" * We know it from the fact that whenever the word 'Bull' is used, it brings about the notion of a particular substance, and not that of a non-entity. For these reasons what has been asserted by the Opponent cannot be right.

(C) Or, the words of the Sūtra '*na svabhāvasiddheḥ* etc.' may be explained to mean as follows.—When you assert (Bhā on Su 37) that "the Bull is non-existent in the form of the Horse", why do not you say that "the Bull is non-existent in the form of the bull"? † That you do not say so indicates that in the form of the Bull the Bull is existent, that is what is meant by the expression '*svabhāvasiddhiḥ*', 'existence in its own form'. [If you really mean that things are non-existent], why cannot you say that the

* The right reading is वस्माच्च गोशब्देन चाभाव उपपत्ते, as found in Purī Ms. B.

† अमन् गोशब्देनैति वस्माच्चोपपत्ते is the better reading as found in Purī Ms. B.

Horse is not-Horse, or that the Bull is not-Bull? Since you do not say so, it follows that *in its own form, the substance exists*

*As a matter of fact, whenever there is denial of non difference—'difference' consisting, in this case, of the absence of conjunction and such other relations, and 'non difference' consisting of identity,—even really existing things come to be spoken of as co substrate (concomitant) with the notion of 'non existence', as we find in the case of the expression 'the jujube fruit is not in the cup', †—so that in the case in question, in the expressions 'the Bull is non-existent in the form of the Horse', 'the Bull is not Horse', what is denied is the non-difference between the Bull and the Horse,—the meaning being that, 'there is no identity between the Bull and the Horse', and this identity being denied, there comes about the co substrateness or concomitance of the notion of 'non-existence' with the thing, 'Bull', hence the expression 'the Bull is non-existent, in the form of the Horse', just as in the sentence 'the jujube fruit is not in the cup', the conjunction of the fruit with the cup being denied, we have the co-substrateness of the notion of 'non existence' with the fruit which is a real entity [All this shows that 'concomitance with the notion of non-existence,' upon which the Opponent bases his arguments, in Bhāṣya, on Sū 37, is not incompatible with real entities]

Sūtra 39

[Objection].—"There is no such thing as the character (or individuality) of things, as what is so regarded has only a relative existence" §

BHĀṢYA

"'Relative' is that which is due to the *relativity* of things e.g., a thing is spoken of as 'long' in relation to what is 'short',

* This, according to the *Vartika* explains how we have the negation expressed in the statement, 'the Bull is not horse'.

† This is an obscure passage, the obscurity being due to wrong readings. From what follows in the next sentence it is clear that the passage should read as follows—अव्यतिरेकप्रतिषेधे असंयोगादिसम्यग्वा व्यतिरेकोऽन्वाह्य-तिरेकोऽभेदाख्यसम्यग् —भावेन असम्यक्त्वस्य सामानाधिकरण्यात् । यथा न सन्ति कुण्डे वदराणीति ।

‡ Satish Chandra Vidyabhusana reads in this Sūtra a reference to the *Mādhyamika Sūtra*

and 'short' in relation to what is 'long', and neither of the two has an absolute existence of its own—Why so?—Because such is the force of relativity. Hence we conclude that there is no such thing as the *character or individuality* of things.”

Sūtra 40

[Answer]—What is put forward cannot be right as it involves a self-contradiction

BHĀṢYA

If a thing is 'long' only relatively to the 'short', then the 'short' should be *non-relative*, for to what would the 'short' be relative? (Similarly) if a thing is 'short' only relatively to the 'long', then the 'long' should be *non-relative* for to what would the 'long' be relative? And if the two depended upon each other, then the negation of one would imply the negation of the other, so that there would be negation of both. Hence it is not right to assert that the character of the 'short' is to be determined only relatively to the 'long' †

Further, if there is no such thing as the 'character' (or individuality) of things, [and all is merely relative], why do we not have the relative notions of 'length' and 'shortness' in regard to two equal Atoms, or to any two objects of equal size? For, taken relatively or non relatively, the two things remain the same, the two things taken relatively remain precisely the same two things, even when not taken relatively, the presence or absence of relativity does not alter the things themselves [so that under the *Pūrvaśāstra* theory, there can be no reason why the notions of 'length' and 'shortness' should not arise in regard to the two Atoms], but if the character of things were purely relative, then the presence of *relativity* (of one thing or the other) would surely make a difference in the nature of things. 'What then is the effect of *relativity* on things?' What *relativity* does

* All things are relative: the blue is blue in relation to, in comparison with the yellow: the father is so in relation to the son and so forth, with all things —*Tātparyā*

† The whole of this passage is read better in Purāṇa B. यदि ह-
स्वापेक्षात् दीर्घं ह्यस्मन्नापक्षिक्म किमिदानीमपेक्ष्य दीर्घमनापक्षिक्म ।
किमिदानीमपेक्ष्य दीर्घमिति पृथगेत्यतः एवमितरेतराभ्ययोरेकाभावऽयतराभावादुभया-
भाव इति दीर्घापेक्षाव्यवस्थाऽनुपपत्ता ।

is that when we perceive two things, it becomes possible for us to perceive the preponderance of one over the other,* that is, when one sees two things and notices a preponderance in one of them, he regards it as 'long', and that which he finds deficient, he regards as 'short', this is what is done by relativity

End of Section (10)

SECTION (11)

[Sutras 41-43]

Examination of certain sweeping assertions in regard to the exact number of things

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The following are the sweeping assertions in regard to the exact number of things —(I) All things are one all being equally existent", (II) 'All things are two being divided into eternal and non eternal' (III) 'All things are three cogniser, cognition and cognised" (IV) "All things are four cogniser, means of cognition cognised and cognition and so on there are other assertions on the same lines It is the examination of these views that proceeds now †

* E.g. When we perceive the bamboo relatively to the sugar cane this relativity leads us to the judgment that the former is longer than the latter or that the latter is shorter than the former

† These views are criticised, because they limit all things within one particular number —According to (I) there is only one thing according to (II) there are two things and so forth

The *Parasuddhi* remarks—The question arise—Why should those views be criticised which are not incompatible with the *Nvya* view of things being the conglomeration or composite of several component particles? But the fact of the matter is that those theories limit things within one definite number only e.g. There are only two things and two only—then inasmuch as those two would be everlasting there would be no explanation of the fact that they bring about their effects only occasionally under this theory the appearance of effects should be unceasing Similarly with the other views

The *Tatparya* offers the following explanations of the two views mentioned in the *Bhāṣya*—

(1) The entire phenomenon of the world is nothing apart from the Light of Consciousness everything is an emanation from this Light There is no difference among cognitions, nor between the cognised object and its cognition, as everything is a manifestation of Consciousness, which is

Sūtra 41

Any absolute limitation of the number (of things) cannot be established, either in the event of the means (of proving it) being available, or in that of its being not available

BHĀṢYA

If the *means* of proving the desired conclusion is (available, and) something different from the conclusion *to be proved*, then no limitation of number can be proved; as the said Means will always, *ex-hypothesi*, be something outside that limited number (which, being included in the 'conclusion to be proved') could not include the *means* of proving (that same conclusion) If, on the other hand, there is no difference between the Means and the Conclusion to be proved by it, then also the limitation of number cannot be proved as there is, *ex-hypothesi*, no real *means* of proving, and in the absence of such means nothing can be proved

Sūtra 42

[Objection]- "What has been urged is not true, as the means (of proving) is only a part (of what is to be proved)"

BHĀṢYA

"It is not true that the limitation of number cannot be proved,—why?—because the means is a part (of what is proved by it), it is only a part of the subject matter of the Proposition which is the Means of proving that Proposition; so that the Means need not be anything different Similarly with the views that *there are only two things*, and so forth "

Sūtra 43

[Answer]—The reason put forward is no reason at all, as (according to the Pūrvaśaka) things can have no 'parts'.

Cognition (II) 'Eternal' and 'non eternal', being contradictory terms must include all things, there can be nothing that is not either 'eternal' or 'non-eternal'

The 'other assertions' referred to in the *Bhāṣya* are—(1) that of the *Sāṃkhya*, that Soul and Primordial Matter are the only two entities, (2) that of the *Bauddha*, that the only entities are the five *skandhas* of Form, Name, Impression, Sensation and Cognition, and (3) that of the *Pāśupata* that the only entities are the *Paśu* (living beings), their bondage, the removal of this bondage, and the Lord

BHĀSYA

The reason put forward (in Su 42) is "as the means of proving is only a part of what is to be proved", but this is not a valid reason,—why?—because the Opponent has laid down the sweeping assertion that "all things are one only", without any exception at all, and then (in the reason put forward) he speaks of a certain thing (the Means of Proving) as being 'one' (part of the subject of the proposition), but there is nothing (apart from that 'one') which, in the Proposition, takes in, *all things*, that could be the 'part' and the necessary 'means of proving'*. Similarly with the other views limiting the number of things to 'two' etc

If all these sweeping assertions in regard to the limitation of the number of things proceed on the basis of the denial of the indefinite number of diversities among things due to their distinctive properties, they militate against well known facts ascertained from Perception, Inference and Verbal Cognition and as such they have to be rejected as wrong doctrines. If, on the other hand they proceed on the basis of the admission of the said diversities, then they renounce their absolutism as the inclusion of things (under any one head) is due to the presence of common properties, and the exclusion (or diversity) of things is due only to the presence of distinct properties [so that the admission of the diversity of things involves the admission of an indefinite number of diversities, and the renouncing of all limitation of the number]

All the above sweeping assertions (from Su 14 to Su 43) have been examined with a view to get at the discernment of True Knowledge

End of Section (II)

* If there were such a thing as the part of what is to be proved then this would mean that there is no absolute limitation of the number of things to one only. When it is stated that "all things are one", nothing is left out so that there is nothing that is not included in the Proposition which could be the proof of that proposition

Sūtra 41

Any absolute limitation of the number (of things) cannot be established, either in the event of the means (of proving it) being available, or in that of its being not available

BHĀṢYA

If the *means* of proving the desired conclusion is (available, and) something different from the conclusion *to be proved*, then no limitation of number can be proved, as the said Means will always, *ex-hypothesi*, be something outside that limited number (which, being included in the 'conclusion to be proved') could not include the *means* of proving (that same conclusion) If, on the other hand, there is no difference between the Means and the Conclusion to be proved by it, then also the limitation of number cannot be proved, as there is, *ex-hypothesi*, no real *means* of proving, and in the absence of such means nothing can be proved

Sūtra 42

[Objection]- "What has been urged is not true, as the means (of proving) is only a part (of what is to be proved)"

BHĀṢYA

"It is not true that the limitation of number cannot be proved,—why?—because the means is a part (of what is proved by it), it is only a part of the subject-matter of the Proposition which is the Means of proving that Proposition, so that the Means need not be anything different Similarly with the views that *there are only two things*, and so forth "

Sūtra 43

[Answer]—The reason put forward is no reason at all, as (according to the Pūrvapakṣa) things can have no 'parts'.

Cognition (II) 'Eternal' and 'non eternal', being contradictory terms, must include all things, there can be nothing that is not either 'eternal' or 'non-eternal'

The "other assertions" referred to in the *Bhāṣya* are—(1) that of the *Saṅkhya*, that Soul and Primordial Matter are the only two entities, (2) that of the *Bauddha*, that the only entities are the five *skandhas* of Form, Name Impression, Sensation and Cognition, and (3) that of the *Paiṣupa*, that the only entities are the *Paśu* (living beings), their bondage, the removal of this bondage, and the Lord

BHĀṢYA

The reason put forward (in Sū 42) is "as the means of proving is only a part of what is to be proved", but this is not a valid reason,—why?—because the Opponent has laid down the sweeping assertion that "all things are one only", without any exception at all, and then (in the reason put forward) he speaks of a certain thing (the Means of Proving) as being 'one' (part of the subject of the proposition), but there is nothing (apart from that 'one') which, in the Proposition, takes in, *all things*, that could be the 'part' and the necessary 'means of proving'*. Similarly with the other views limiting the number of things to 'two' etc

If all these sweeping assertions in regard to the limitation of the number of things proceed on the basis of the denial of the indefinite number of diversities among things due to their distinctive properties, they militate against well known facts ascertained from Perception, Inference and Verbal Cognition and as such they have to be rejected as wrong doctrines. If, on the other hand they proceed on the basis of the admission of the said diversities, then they renounce their absolutism as the inclusion of things (under any one head) is due to the presence of common properties, and the exclusion (or diversity) of things is due only to the presence of distinct properties (so that the admission of the diversity of things involves the admission of an indefinite number of diversities, and the renouncing of all limitation of the number)

All the above sweeping assertions (from Sū 14 to Sū 43) have been examined with a view to get at the discernment of True Knowledge

End of Section (II)

* If there were such a thing as the part of what is to be proved then this would mean that there is no absolute limitation of the number of things to one only. When it is stated that 'all things are one', nothing is left out so that there is nothing that is not included in the Proposition which could be the proof of that proposition.

SECTION (12)

[Sūtras 44-54]

On Fruition—the Tenth object of Cognition

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

*After Rebirth, comes Fruition ; and with regard to this—**Sūtra 44*

there arises a doubt since the fulfilment of the result (of acts) is found to appear immediately as well as after some time

BHĀṢYA

When a man cooks rice or milks the cow, the results, in the shape of the Rice and the Milk respectively, appear immediately ; whereas when he ploughs the field and sows the seeds, the result in the shape of the Harvest, accrues to him after some time, — now the *Agnihotra* is an act, the performance whereof is laid down in the text 'One desiring heaven should perform the *Agnihotra*', and in regard to the fruition of this act, there arises a doubt (as to whether or not any results follow it, and if they do, when they follow, and so forth) *

Sūtra 45

[*Siddhānta*]—The fruition is not immediate, because it is such as can be experienced only at a later time †

* Says the *Parīśuddhi*—It is not possible that there should be any such doubt regarding *Fruition* in general, as to whether it appears immediately after the act, or after the lapse of some time, for so far as the acts of cooking, etc., are concerned, it is already ascertained that their fruition is immediate, and in regard to the acts of *Agnihotra*, etc., also it is already known that their fruition comes only after the lapse of some time. But what gives rise to the doubt is the very fact of the *Agnihotra* etc., being *actions*, involving the effort of an intelligent agent, and inasmuch as it is found that the activities of intelligent beings are of both kinds—some having their fruition immediately and others after the lapse of time, there is nothing to show for certain to which of the two classes the action of *Agnihotra* belongs.

† This *Sūtra* is not found in the *Nyāyatuchasambandha* and the *Tātparyā* calls it 'Bhāṣya'. Viśvanātha treats it as a *Sūtra*, and it is found in the *Pūrā* 'Sūtra' Ms. as also in *Sūtra* Ms. C and D.

The *Siddhānta* embodied in the *Sūtra* is in answer to the *Purropekṣa* that it is not necessary to assume any invisible superphysical results for *Agnihotra*, etc., since we find them bringing about the immediate result in the shape of Fame etc.—*Uśānatha*.

BHĀṢYA

‘Heaven’ is the result mentioned in the scriptures, and the attainment of Heaven accrues only to another body, which comes after the present body has been destroyed, and in the case of actions done with a view to the acquiring of landed property also, we find that the result does not appear immediately after the actions have been done *

Sūtra 46

[Objection]—“The fruition cannot appear at another time, as the cause thereof will have ceased to exist”

BHĀṢYA

“The actual action (the sacrificial performance) having ceased to exist, the result of that action could not come about, in the absence of its cause (in the shape of the action) for, as a matter of fact, no effect is ever found to be produced out of a cause that has ceased to exist

Sūtra 47

[Answer]—Prior to the actual fulfilment of the fruition there would be something (in the shape of an inter-mediary), just as there is in the case of the fruit of trees

BHĀṢYA

The man who desires fruits renders such services to the tree as pouring water at its roots, and so forth, and it is only after the actual act of watering has ceased to exist that the earth particles (under the tree’s roots) become lumped together by the particles of water, and becoming heated with the heat underground, they produce a juicy substance, this juicy substance, as modified by the heat, comes into contact with the tree and, in a peculiarly modified form enters into it and produces the leaf etc., and the fruit,—in this manner the action of watering is fruitful, and yet the result does not quite follow from a cause that has entirely ceased to exist. In the same manner actions produce (in the Soul) a faculty in the shape of *Dharma-Adharma*, Merit Demerit, and this faculty, after being produced, comes to be helped

* Part M B reads *यामादिवन्नाम्* which would mean that—‘in the case of the actions done by men still in the meshes of ignorance’. But in view of what follows later on in the *Bhāṣya*, the reading of the *Yat* text is better

by other causes and thus brings about the results at a later time. This is what we have already explained under Sū 3-2 60, where it has been shown that 'the body comes into existence on account of the continuity of the results of previous deeds'

Pūrvapakṣa

Says the Opponent—

Sūtra 48

"Prior to its fulfilment, the accomplished fruition (result) cannot be either (A) non-existent, (B) or existent, (C) or existent-non-existent, because 'existent' and 'non-existent' are contradictory"

BHĀṢYA

(a) "A thing that is liable to be accomplished (produced) could not be *non-existent*, before its production, because of the restriction in regard to the material cause of things, that is, as a matter of fact, for the bringing about of a certain product (the Jar, e g) it is only the particular material (Clay) that is brought in, and it is not that any and every material is brought in for the making of all things, there could not be this limitation or restriction (in the form that one product is produced out of only one material substance, and not from all substances), if the product were absolutely *non-existent* (before its production)" †

(b) "Nor could the thing be *existent* (prior to its production), because if the thing already exists, before it is brought about, there could not (need not) be a further 'production' of that same thing"

* The question going to be discussed now is whether the Fruition or Result of Acts is something that, prior to its being brought about was—(1) already existent, or (2) non-existent, or (3) both existent and non-existent, or (4) neither existent nor non-existent. The Pūrvapakṣa propounded in the Sūtra is that no one of these alternatives is possible, hence there can be no such thing as the 'fruition' of actions —*Tātparjā*

The fourth of these alternatives is found in the *Vārtika*, not in the *Sūtra* or in the *Bhāṣya*. In this *Sūtra* also Dr. Satish Chandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa finds a reference to the *Mādhyamikā-Sūtras*

† The very fact that it is only out of Clay that the Jar is produced, clearly shows that the Jar already exists in the Clay Cf *Saṅkhyakārika*, 9—'*Upadanograhanaṭ*'

(c) 'Nor could the thing be both *existent* and *non-existent*, because '*existent*' and '*non-existent*' are contradictory the term '*existent*' affirms a thing, while the term '*non-existent*' denies it, and it is this mutually contradictory character that is spoken of as '*dissimilarity*' (in the Sūtra), and because of this fact their being contradictories, no co-existence of them is possible''

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The truth of the matter is that prior to being produced, the thing to be produced was *non-existent*—"How so —

Sūtra 49

Because we perceive the production as well as destruction (of things) *

BHĀṢYA

It has been alleged (in the Bhāṣya on Sū 48) by the *Pūrvapakṣin* that—"Prior to its production, the Product is not non-existent, because of the restriction in regard to the material cause of things"—[the answer to that is as follows]—

Sūtra 50

That the product is *non-existent* is clearly proved by that very conception

BHĀṢYA

The conception (of restriction in regard to the material cause, which the Opponent has cited) is in the form '*this thing, and not all things, is capable of producing this effect*', and this conception clearly proves that prior to being produced, every effect is known as capable of being produced by a particular cause, and that this conception is correct is shown by the fact that the production of the effect is actually in accordance with that conception, and in fact it is only on the basis of this conception that we can explain the restriction in regard to the cause of things. If, on the other hand, the product is already existent, prior to being produced, then there can be no such thing as its '*production*' [so that there could be no conception

* prior to being produced, it means that it can be production or destruction of it

at all in regard to its being produced out of only a particular material cause] *

Sūtra 51

[*Objection*—The receptacles being different [in the case of the fruition of acts], it is not right to argue that it is like the fruition of trees '—

BHĀṢYA

" [In the case of the fruition of trees] it is found that the services rendered in the shape of the watering of the roots and so forth as well as the *fruition* both are in the tree itself—both have the same tree for their receptacle, [in the case of the fruition of actions] on the other hand, the action occurs in the present body, while the fruition appears in the next body so that there being a difference in the receptacles what has been urged (in Su 47) does not prove anything at all (in regard to the sacrificial acts being the cause of fruition in the shape of Heaven, etc)

Sūtra 52

[*Answer*—Inasmuch as Happiness subsists in the Soul the objection has no force at all

BHĀṢYA

Happiness being perceptible to the Soul subsists in the Soul *action* also—in the form known as '*Dharma*' 'Merit—subsists in the Soul—as *Dharma* is a quality of the Soul thus then there is no possibility of *receptacles being different* †

Sūtra 53

[*Objection*—' What has been just said is not true as [the obtaining of] Son, Wife Cattle, Clothing Gold Food and such things is mentioned as the fruit (of acts) '—

* The very conception that a thing is produced only out of a certain cause proves that before being produced that thing must be non-existent. The weaver takes up the yarns with the idea—the Cloth *shall be produced* out of this and not that the Cloth is here already for in the latter case why should he put forth any effort to bring into existence the Cloth which already exists?

† Heaven, which is the result of sacrificial acts is only a form of *Happiness* and Happiness subsists in the Soul not in the Body and Soul remains the same through the several lives

BHĀṢYA

"As a matter of fact, what is mentioned as the 'fruit' is the obtaining of such things as the son etc. and not 'Happiness', we have such assertions as—'one who desires landed property should perform *this* sacrifice' 'one who desires a son should perform *that* sacrifice', and so forth. So that the assertion (under Su 52) that 'Happiness is the fruit of actions' is not true.

Sūtra 54

[Answer]—Inasmuch as the real fruition follows from connection with the things mentioned, it is only indirectly (figuratively) that these latter are spoken of as the 'fruit'.

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact the real fruition in the shape of Happiness results from connection with the son wife etc. and it is for this reason that these latter are regarded or spoken of, only indirectly as fruit', just as food is (indirectly) spoken of as 'Life', in such statements as 'Food is life itself'.

End of Section (12)

SECTION (13)

{Sūtras 55-58}

Examination of the nature of Pain

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

After 'Fruition' (in Su 1-19) is mentioned 'Pain', and this has been defined (in Su 1-21) as 'that which is connected with annoyance is Pain'. But now the question is raised—"Does the Siddhāntin mean to totally deny such a thing as 'Pleasure', which is felt by every personality? or does he mean something else?"

* *Question*—'What is it that has to be examined in the present section? No one denies that there is such a thing as Pain, nor is there any doubt as to its being a thing to be got rid of, it might be useful to examine whether it is eternal or not, but it has already been established, in course of our refutation of the doctrine that all things are eternal, what causes pain is also well known to be such things as the serpent, the thorn and so forth. Activity has been fully examined as also its Effects in the form of Birth etc., and how the cessation of the cause leads to the cessation of its effects has been shown under Sū 1-12. What then has remained uninvestigated for the sake of which the present section has been taken up?'

Our answer is that the meaning of the *Siddhāntin* is something different. "Why so?" It is not possible to totally deny¹ Pleasure, to whose existence testimony is borne by all men. The teaching (of the *Siddhānta*) that Pleasure should be looked upon as 'Pain' is meant for the removal of all pain for the person who has become disgusted with the sufferings caused by the experiences undergone during a series of births and deaths and is anxious to get rid of all similar experiences * "But by what method (is this advice effective)?" The bodies of all living beings, all the regions where people are born, all rebirth (all conditions of life), every one of these is beset with 'annoyance', being inseparable from Pain, and it is in view of this fact that the sages have tendered the advice contained in the Sūtra 'Pain is that which is connected with annoyance' (Su 1-1 21), and the meaning of this is that all the aforesaid things should be looked upon as 'Pain'† Reasons for this view are put forward in the following *Sūtra*

Answer—Pain has been defined as that which is connected with annoyance, by 'annoyance' here is meant the *feeling of annoyance*, and this according to the *Siddhānta* includes not only Pain and its causes but *Pleasure* also. If this is duly realised then there is no room for the question put by the *Purvapakṣin* but he has put the question in view of the primary meaning of the term annoyance, which is restricted to *Pain only* —*Parīśuddhi*

The sense of the *Purvapakṣa* has been thus expounded in the *Tatparya*— 'We admit that *Pain* is that which is connected with annoyance but that which is experienced by every personality as *Pleasure*, that certainly could not be regarded as *Pain* as this would be contrary to experience. As regards the Body and the Sense organs etc.—if they are to be regarded as Pain because they are the Source of Pain, they may be regarded as 'Pleasure' also, as being the source of Pleasure. In fact the timidity involved in the idea of regarding everything as pain is likely to strike at the root of all worldly usage. As a matter of fact, when a man eats meat he removes all the bones and hence does not suffer the pain that might be due to the bones similarly a wise man will enjoy Pleasure only taking care to avoid all that may be likely to bring pain. It is in view of all this that the *Purvapakṣin* has put the question

* The *Tatparya* explains the expression *utpattisthānani* as the regions for the acquiring of things which bring pleasure and pain

† If it were possible to obtain pleasure unmixed with pain no intelligent person would ever seek to get rid of it as a matter of fact, however, no such unalloyed pleasure is ever met with, hence what the *Siddhānta* means is not the total denial of all Pleasure but that all Pleasure should be looked upon as Pain. —*Tatparya*

ances', Pleasure is actually accomplished and experienced by all living beings, and hence it cannot be denied entirely

Further,—

Sūtra 57

There is no denial [of Pleasure], because [all that is meant is that] inasmuch as the Man experiencing pleasure is oppressed with the frailty of longing, there is no cessation of annoyance for him

BHĀṢYA

The 'non denial' (in the Sūtra) is meant to be that of *Pleasure*—by the teaching that it should be looked upon as 'Pain', that such is the meaning of the Sūtra is clear from the context 'Longing'—is wish, the eager desire for acquiring a thing, and the 'frailty of this longing' is as follows—when the man experiences pleasure from a certain thing, he desires that thing,—and sometimes the desire is not fulfilled, or if fulfilled, it is fulfilled only in part, or is fulfilled in such form as is beset with obstacles,—and from this 'frailty of longing' there arise various kinds of mental suffering, so that *the man experiencing pleasure, being oppressed with the frailty of longing there is no cessation of annoyance for him*,—and it is because there is no cessation of annoyance that it has been taught that Pleasure should be looked upon as 'Pain'. It is for this reason that Birth is 'pain', and not because there is no pleasure at all. This is the idea that has been expressed in the following verses—

(1) 'For the man who desires a desirable thing, as soon as that desire is fulfilled, another desire quickly besets him'

(2) 'Even though a man obtains the entire sea-girt Earth, along with all cows and horses, that seeker after wealth does not become satisfied with that wealth, what pleasure, then, can there be for one who desires wealth?'

Sūtra 58

Also because there are several kinds of Pain which people wrongly regard as pleasure,—

BHĀṢYA

'we have the instruction that Pleasure should be regarded as Pain' [these words complete the sentence of the Sūtra]

The ordinary man, addicted to pleasure, regards Pleasure as the highest end of man, and feels that there is nothing better than Pleasure, and hence when Pleasure has been attained, he feels happy and contented, feeling that all he had to attain had been attained, and under the influence of illusion he becomes attached to the Pleasure, as also to the things that bring about its accomplishment, becoming so attached, he makes an attempt to obtain the pleasure, and while he is trying for it, there come down upon him several kinds of Pain, in the form of birth, old age, disease, death, the contact of disagreeable things, separation from agreeable things, the non fulfilment of desires and so forth, and yet all these several kinds of Pain he regards as 'Pleasure'. In fact Pain is a necessary factor in Pleasure without suffering some pain no pleasure can be obtained hence as leading to Pleasure, this Pain is regarded by the man as Pleasure, and such a man, having his mind obsessed by this notion of 'Pleasure', never escapes from metempsychosis, which consists of a running series of births and deaths. And it is as an antidote of this notion of Pleasure that we have the teaching that all this should be looked upon as 'Pain'.

Birth has been called 'pain' because of its being beset with 'pain', and not because there is no such thing as Pleasure.

Objection —“ If that is so, then why is it not said simply (in Su 55) that 'Birth is Pain' ? When this simple expression might have been used, the fact of the Sūtra having used the expression 'Birth is only pain' shows that the idea meant to be conveyed is that *there is no pleasure at all* ”

Answer —What the emphatic term 'eva', 'only', implies is that what is laid down is conducive to the cessation of Birth. 'How [does the particle serve the purpose of indicating the cessation of Birth] ?' What it means is that Birth is pain, not by its own nature, but by reason of its being beset with Pain, and so with Pleasure also [which is 'Pain' because it is intermingled with Pain, and not because there is no such thing as Pleasure]. This is what is meant by the words of the Sūtra (55),—and not that in Birth there is *only Pain* (and *no Pleasure at all*)

End of Section (13)

SECTION (14)

[Sūtras 59-68]

Examination of the Nature of Final Release

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

After 'Pain', 'Release' [has been mentioned and desired]

"This Release is thus denied (by the Opponent)—

Sūtra 59

Puroapaksa

"Since there is concatenation (a) of Debts, (b) of Aberrations and (c) of Activity,—there can be no Release"—

BHĀṢYA

"(a) *On account of the concatenation of debts there can be no Release* The 'debts' are thus described (in the *S'atapatha Brahmana*, 17 2 1)—'When the Brahmana is born, he is born with three debts from the debt owing to the Risis he becomes freed by leading the life of the Religious Student, from the debt owing to Divine Beings he is freed by the performance of sacrifices, and from the debt owing to the Fathers he is freed by begetting children',—the 'concatenation of these debts consists in the connection (presence) of acts connected with the debts', that it is necessary throughout one's life to perform these acts (towards the clearing of the debts) is thus mentioned (in the Veda)—'The sacrifices known as the *Agnihotra* and the *Darsa pūrnamāsa* should go on till old age or death—it is only by either old age or death that one becomes freed from the necessity of performing the said sacrifices'—So that the concatenation of these debts persisting (till the man's old age or death) there is no time left for the performance of acts conducive to Release, hence it follows that there can be no Release'

'(b) *On account of the concatenation of Aberrations, there can be no Release* The man dies beset with aberrations [viz, Ignorance, Egoism, Affection, Hatred and Yearning for Life] and he is born beset with aberrations, and he is never found to be absolutely free from the concatenation of these aberrations [from which it follows that he can never be free from Births and Deaths, i.e., there can be no Release] "

" (c) *On account of the concatenation of Activity, there can be no Release.* From birth till death, man is never found to be absolutely free from the 'Operating of Speech, Mind and Body'. From this it follows that the assertion made (in Su 1-1 2) to the effect that—'there is a cessation of each member of the following series—Pain, Birth, Activity, Defect and Wrong Notion—the cessation of that which follows bringing the annihilation of that which precedes it, and this ultimately leads to Release'—is not true "

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Siddhānta

Our answer to the above is as follows —(A) Our answer to the argument, that " since there is concatenation of Debts etc , etc ",—is that the term 'Debt' (in the texts quoted) stands for *what is like debt*

Sūtra 60

Inasmuch as the word cannot be taken in its primary signification, the statement must be taken as a description by means of a word used in its secondary (figurative) signification , specially as it is only thus that the sense of condemnation and commendation is obtained

BHĀṢYA

The word 'rñath', (in the passage quoted from the *S'atapatha Brāhmaṇa*) is not used in its primary sense of *debt*, the word 'debt' can be used in its primary sense only in a case where one gives to another something that has to be repaid and another receives such a thing , and this condition is not present in the case spoken of in the passage quoted , hence it follows that—*inasmuch as the word 'debts' cannot be taken in its primary signification, the statement must be taken as a description by means of a word used in its secondary (figurative) signification*, the sense being that what are described are '*like debts*'. Such figurative descriptions are very common , e g , when the 'young student' is described as 'Fire', just as the word 'Fire' elsewhere used in one (the primary) sense is applied to the young student in another (figurative) sense,—so in the case in question, the word 'debt', elsewhere found used in the primary sense, is used in the passage quoted in a different

sense " But why should there be a description by means of a word in the figurative sense ? " *Because it is only thus that the sense of condemnation and commendation is obtained*,—the meaning of the passage being that " if a person fails to perform the acts referred to, he is *condemned* in the same manner as the debtor, not repaying his debts, and if he does perform the acts, he is *commended* in the same manner as the debtor, repaying his debts, this is what is meant by the figurative description of the acts as 'debts'

The word 'jāyamānah', 'when he is born', is also used figuratively, as otherwise (if the word were taken in its literal sense), the man would not be entitled to the performance of the acts mentioned, what the phrase, 'when the Brāhmana is born' means is 'when the Brahmana enters the state of the Householder',—this is what is meant by the man 'being born', (that such must be the sense is clear from the fact that) it is only when the Brahmana enters the state of the Householder that he becomes entitled to the performance of the act mentioned, on merely being *born from his mother's womb* (which is the primary meaning of 'being born') the Brāhmana is not entitled to the performance of those acts, as a matter of fact when the child is just born from his mother's womb he is not in a position to perform any acts, for only such persons are entitled to the performance of an act as (a) are *desirous* of acquiring the results following from that act and (b) are *capable* of performing it (a) That to be entitled to the performance of an act it is necessary to have the desire for results calculated to follow from that act, is shown by the fact that the injunctions of the acts always speak of the presence of such desire, e.g., in the injunction *one desiring heaven should offer the Agnihotra libations* and (b) that to be so entitled one must be *capable* of performing the act is shown by the fact that it is only a person who is capable of doing an act that can do it, since it is only a capable man that can do an act it follows that it is only a capable man that is entitled to the performance of that act, as a matter of fact, it is only the *capable* man, and none other, who actually undertakes the performance of an act. If the word 'born' were taken in its primary sense (of *coming out* of the mother's womb), then both these conditions

Then again, we find *verses* and *prose-texts* speaking of Final Release, as a matter of fact, we find several Rk verses and Brāhmaṇa texts speaking of Final Release (along with the means of attaining it, and the four states, specially that of the Renunciate, fall under these) As instances of verses, we have the following — (a) 'The sages, blessed with children and desiring wealth, fell into death (and rebirth) by performing actions, other sages, who were endowed with wisdom, transcending beyond actions, attained immortality', — (b) 'Neither by action, nor by progeny, nor by wealth,—but by renunciation, only—did they attain immortality, that immortality which shines beyond Heaven, hidden in the cave (beyond ordinary cognitions, which the renunciates alone enter)' (*Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* 10-10-3), — (c) 'I know that Great Person, effulgent like the Sun, lying beyond Illusion, by knowing Him alone does man transcend death, there is no other path for going beyond' (*Vājasaneyi Samhitā* 31-18), and as prose-texts we have the following — (a) 'There are three stages of Dharma—Sacrifices, Study, and Charity, the first of these constitutes Austerity, the second as the Religious Student residing in the house of the Teacher, and the third is the same person putting himself under severe penance while residing in the Teacher's house, all these lead man to pure regions it is only one who is firm in Brahman (i.e. the Renunciate) who reaches immortality' (*Chāṇḍogya Upaniṣad*, 2-22-1), — (b) 'It is with a view to attain this region that Renunciates take to renunciation' (*Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad*, 4-4-22), (c) 'They say that man is made up of desires, as he desires so does he put forth efforts and as he puts forth efforts, so does he act, and as he acts so does he become,'—having in this way described the process of metempsychosis determined by the performance of acts, the texts go on to lay down the real teaching thus—'When the man with desires becomes free from desires, he becomes without desires, beyond desires, having all his desires fulfilled, his desires centred in the Self,—then his life breaths do not go out, they become absorbed here and now, being Brahman, he attains Brahman itself' (*Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad*, 4-4 5 and 6)

Thus then we find that the assertion that—"Since there is concatenation of debts, there can be no Release"—is not right

There is yet another text—'The four paths leading to the Divine Beings' (*Taittirīyasaṃhitā* 5-7-23)—which speaks of the four states, and hence also it is not right to say that there is only one state (that of the Householder) laid down in the Veda [and that the state of the Renunciate is nowhere enjoined].

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, the passage speaking of 'the *Agnihotra* and the *Dars'apūrnamāsa* sacrifice continuing till old age and death' must refer to the man that desires the results (following from those acts) "Why?"

Sūtra 61

Inasmuch as there is transportation (of the Fires) into the Soul, the Denial (of Release) cannot be right

BHĀṢYA

It is laid down in the Veda that—'Having offered the *Prājāpatya* sacrifice, having offered the libation of all his belongings, and having transported the Fires into his Soul the Brāhmana should go out as a Renunciate',—and from this we learn that the 'transportation of the Fires' (which means the end of the *Agnihotra*) is only for the man who has risen above all desires for children, wealth and fame, and when his desire for the results (of the *Agnihotra*) also have entirely ceased. To this same end we have the following Brāhmana-passage (*Bṛhadāranyaka* 4 5) — 'Yājñavalkya, when going to undertake another austerity, said to Maitreyī as follows: Oh, dear one, I am going to wander away from this place, I shall therefore make up an understanding between you and Kātyāyana, you have already had your instructions, O Maitreyī! Immortality extends only so far,—having said this Yājñavalkya went away as a renunciate.'

Sūtra 62

Inasmuch as the 'collecting of sacrificial vessels' could not be possible in their case, the Results mentioned cannot pertain to others (than Householders)

BHĀṢYA

If the performance of the acts till 'old age and death' were taken as referring to *all men* (Householders as well as Renunciates), then the after-death rites ending with the 'collecting of the

sacrificial vessels' would also have to be performed for *all men*, and in that case there would be no point in the describing of the 'rising above desires', which we meet with in such passages as the following—'The ancient Brahmanas, great teachers and learned do not desire offspring, their idea being—what shall we do with offspring, we for whom the Self is the whole world?—it is these Brahmanas that, having risen above desire for sons, desire for wealth and desire for fame live upon alms' (*Brhadāranyaka-Upaniṣad*, 3 5 1) Because for one who has 'risen above desires' (including also the desire for results accruing from the *Agnihotra* etc) there can be no possibility of those rites that end with the 'collecting of sacrificial vessels' Specially because Results do not supply sufficient motive to all men to the same extent

Further, since we find *four stages* of life laid down in the *Itihasas*, the *Puranas* and the *Dharmasāstra* scriptures, it is not right to hold (as the Purvapakṣin does) that there is only one stage (that of the Householder) It will not be right to regard the said scriptures as having no authority, for the authoritative character of these is vouched for by authoritative texts, as a matter of fact, the authoritative character of *Itihasas* and *Puranas* is vouched for by *Brahmana texts* which are entirely authoritative, e.g., 'The *Atharvanguṛasas* declared the *Itihasas* and *Puranas* and these *Itihasas* and *Puranas* constitute the fifth of the Vedas' (*Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 3-4-2) For these reasons it is not right to say that the said *Itihasas* and *Puranas* are not authoritative As regards the *Dharmasāstra* scriptures, if these had no authority, there would be an end to all business among living beings, which would put the whole world into confusion Secondly, inasmuch as the 'seers' and 'speakers' are the same, there is no reason why these scriptures should not be authoritative, as a matter of fact, the 'seers' and 'speakers' of the *Itihasas*, *Puranas* and *Dharmasāstra* scriptures are the same as those of the *Mantra* and *Brāhmaṇa* texts (of the Veda) Thirdly, inasmuch as there is a restriction in regard to their subject matter (the said scriptures must be authoritative), as a matter of fact the authority of each scripture bears upon its own special subject matter, and the subject matter of the *Mantra* and *Brāhmaṇa* texts is different from that of the *Itihasas*, *Puranas* and the

Dharmaśāstra scriptures, e.g., 'sacrificial performance' forms the subject matter of the *Mantra* and *Brāhmaṇa* texts, the 'doings of men' that of *Itihāsas* and *Purāṇas*, and the 'regulation of men's business' that of the *Dharmaśāstra* scriptures. So that since no single one of these regulates all the said subjects, every one of them must be regarded as authoritative in regard to its own special subject, just as every one of the sense organs is an authoritative means of the cognition of its own special object of perception.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

As regards the second argument propounded by the *Pūrvapakṣin* (in Su 59) viz "since there is no cessation of concatenation of the aberrations (there can be no Release)"—our answer is as follows —

Sūtra 63

Release is possible inasmuch as (we find that) there are no aberrations in the case of the man in deep sleep, who dreams no dreams

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, we find that when a man is in deep sleep and dreams no dreams, there is an end (for the time being) of all connection with attachment, as also of all connection with pleasure and pain. Exactly in the same way there could be an end of all these at Release also. In fact people who have realised the real nature of Brahman actually describe the condition of the 'released' Soul as similar to that of *deep sleep* *.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

As regards the third argument—viz, 'because there is concatenation of Activity,'—our answer is as follows —

Sūtra 64

For the man whose aberrations have been destroyed, Activity does not lead to recrudescence

* The only difference being that while during deep sleep, the tendency of aberrations is present—[by virtue of which the man becomes beast with them on waking]—at Release there is no such tendency left [so that there is no chance of the Released man being re-beast with aberrations]—*Tātparyā*

BHĀṢYA

When Love, Hatred and Ignorance (which are the aberrations) have been destroyed, *Activity does not lead to recrudescence*; —'Recrudescence' stands for re-birth at the end of the previous birth, and since this rebirth is always brought about by Desire,* —when all Desire has been destroyed, there is no further birth after the previous one has come to an end, and this is what is meant by 'non-recrudescence', and this is *Release*

"But this would mean that actions are fruitless."

Certainly not, for our doctrine does not deny the experiencing of the fruition of one's acts. All that we say is that the previous birth having come to an end, there is no further birth, and we do not say that there is no experiencing of the fruits of one's acts; this comes about in the last birth (preceding Release) [so that there is no fruition left to be experienced]

Sūtra 65

[Objection.]—"What has been just alleged is not possible as the concatenation of aberrations is innate (in man)"

BHĀṢYA

[Says the *Pūrvapakṣin*]—"Cessation of the concatenation of aberrations is not possible, —why?—because the concatenation of aberrations is innate in man, as a matter of fact, the concatenation of aberrations is without beginning, and what is beginningless can never be destroyed"

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

To the above objection some people (Ekadeśī—Logicians) make the following reply

Sūtra 66

(A) 'Just as there is evanescence of the negation of things prior to their coming into existence,—so there can be evanescence of innate things also'

BHĀṢYA

"The negation or absence of things, prior to their coming into existence, has had no beginning, and yet it is set aside by

* The reading तद्वाटकारित does not fit in with तस्याम्. In the *Vārtika* we find the expression तच्च तृष्णाकारितम्; so that we prefer to read the *Bhāṣya* also as तच्च तृष्णाकारितम्, and to take तस्या as referring to तृष्णा

the existence of the things when they are produced;—and in the same manner the concatenation of the aberrations* also, though without beginning, may be liable to be set aside†

Sūtra 67

(B) 'Or it may be like the evanescence of the dark colour of the Atom.'

BHĀṢYA

Others again offer the following answer to the objection (urged in Su 65) —

'The dark colour of the Atom (of Earth) is beginningless, and yet it is destroyed by contact with fire, similarly the concatenation of aberrations [though beginningless, could be destroyed]'

BHĀṢYA

(A) As a matter of fact, 'eternality' and 'evanescence' are properties of existent things, so they can be predicated directly of positive entities only, to negative entities they can be attributed only indirectly (or figuratively) [So that it is not right to cite the case of the negation of things, as the *Ekadeśin* has done in Su 65] (B) Then, as regards the 'dark colour of the Atom' (cited by the second *Ekadeśin* in Su 66), there is nothing to prove that it is *without beginning*,* and hence it is not right to put that forward as an instance. Nor is there anything to prove that a thing *not liable to production* is *evanescent*

The real answer to the argument of the *Pūroṣapakṣin* (put forward in Su 65) is as follows —

Sūtra 68

What has been alleged by the Opponent cannot be right, also because (a) desire and the rest have their source in misapprehension†

* On the other hand, we have the following argument to prove that the dark colour of the Atom is *not without beginning* — 'The dark colour of the Atom is a *product*, because it is a Colour of the Earth, just like its red colour'—*Tatparya*

† On the exact meaning of the term '*sankalpa*' in the present context, the *Tatparya* says — Though it is the wish for a cognised thing that is generally called '*sankalpa*', yet here we have to take it as referring to the cognition that is the precursor of the wish, hence it should be taken here as standing for strong cognition, misapprehension

BHĀṢYA

The particle 'ca', 'also', has a cumulative force, including the following two reasons also—(b) *because Desire and the rest are due to action*, and (c) *because Desire and the rest are due to one another*

(a) As a matter of fact, Desire, Hatred and Illusion proceed from such wrong cognitions (respectively) as the actual *delighters, annoyers and deluders* of men (b) Action also is what brings about the bodies of living beings, and gives rise to Desire, Hatred and Illusion, within well-defined limits, that it is so we gather from the fact that there is a limitation in regard to these, e.g. a certain animal body is found to abound in Desire, while another abounds in Illusion (c) Lastly, the appearance of Desire etc. is due to one another, that is, it is the man under illusion who desires things, it is the man under illusion who is moved by hatred, the man under the influence of desire falls into illusion, and the man under the influence of hatred falls into illusion

All misapprehensions cease to appear as soon as True Knowledge appears, and inasmuch as on the cessation of the cause, the effect cannot appear, there is absolute non-appearance of Desire etc. (on the disappearance of Misapprehensions, which are the source of Desire etc.)

Further, the assertion that "the concatenation of aberrations is beginningless" has no point at all. As *all things* related to the Soul,—e.g., the Body, the Sense organs etc. etc.—are such as proceed in a beginningless series, and there is not a single individual of this series that is produced without another individual having gone before it with the sole exception of *True Knowledge* (which is produced *once and once only* for a Soul), but our doctrine (that Desire etc. are destroyed) does not imply the assumption that 'things not liable to be produced are liable to destruction' [as the *individual* Desire etc. whose destruction we postulate are not *without beginning*, the beginninglessness of the *series* does not simply the *beginninglessness* of each individual constituting the series, e.g., *one series of Bodies* for each Soul is beginningless, yet each individual Body has a beginning]. As soon as *misapprehensions* have been dispelled by *True Knowledge*, 'Action' also, which is what brings about the Body of each living body, ceases to be a productive of Desire etc., though it continues to bring about (for some time) the experiencing of pleasure and pain

End of Section (14)

DISCOURSE IV
DAILY LESSON II

SECTION (I)

[Sūtras 1-3]

Dealing with the Appearance of True Knowledge
INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

*Question—"Now, Sir, does *True Knowledge* appear in connection with each one of the several things that there are? Or only in connection with some of them?—What difference does that make?—Well, as a matter of fact, it would not be possible for it to appear in connection with each of the things, for the simple reason that the number of things to be known is endless. Nor again could the True Knowledge be held to appear only in connection with some of the things, for in connection with

* The *Tatparya* introduces this Daily Lesson thus: *Doubt, Instruments of and Objects of Cognition* have been only examined, —*Metu* and the rest also have been examined by implication under *Sūtra* 2-1-2. So that all the sixteen categories have been examined. It has been declared in *Sū* 1-1-1 that the 'true knowledge' of these categories is the means of attaining the highest good, it has also been explained that it is the 'true knowledge' or cognition of objects that leads directly to the attainment of the highest good, that of the others helps only indirectly. What we proceed to examine now is whether from among the Soul and the other objects of cognition, it is the true knowledge of only a few, or that of all, that brings about the highest good.

On this the *Parasuddhi*—In the first Daily Lesson of this *Adhyaya*, six objects of cognition have been examined, and we now proceed to examine 'True Knowledge', which pertains to them. The questions for determination are—(a) What is 'True Knowledge'? (b) To what things does it pertain? (c) How is it maintained? (d) How does it improve? First of all we proceed to consider—*to what does True Knowledge pertain and how does it appear?*

The *Nyāyabandhāprakāśa* raises the objection, (i) that it is not right to proceed with the examination of 'True Knowledge' before having defined it; and (ii) that there is no sameness of subject-matter between the two Daily Lessons, and hence there is no reason why they should form part of the same *Adhyaya*. The answers provided by it are as follows:—(i) The definition of 'True Knowledge' has been provided, by implication, in *Sūtra* 1-1-2, and (ii) the real subject of the *Adhyaya* is the Examination of 'objects of cognition' in the form of 'Effects', and 'True Knowledge' also is an effect.

those few things with reference to which True Knowledge would not appear, the man's Illusion would not cease, so that there would still be a residue of Illusion left behind, nor could the Illusion in regard to one thing be removed by True Knowledge in regard to another thing "

Answer —'Illusion' consists in *wrong notion, misapprehension*, —not in mere *absence of True Knowledge*, and what is to be sought after is the *True Knowledge* of that thing the wrong notion of which becomes the active seed of metempsychosis *

Question —"What is that *wrong notion* [which leads to metempsychosis]?"

Answer —The notion of what is *not-Soul* as 'Soul',—appearing in such forms as 'I am', this is the *notion of 'I'* (Egoism, *Ahankāra*) 'Illusion', † When one looks upon the not Soul as 'I am', this is the conception that is called the notion of I' (Egoism, *Ahankāra*)

Question —"What are those things in regard to which people have the notion of 'I'?"

Answer —They are—the Body, the Sense organs, the Mind, Feelings and Cognitions

Question —'In what way does the *notion of I'* in regard to these become the seed of metempsychosis?"

* It is the Soul and such things connected with the Soul which when wrongly known lead to birth and death hence it is the wrong notion of these things that has to be got rid of as it is the True Knowledge of these that leads to the cessation of metempsychosis. The different views are— (1) True Knowledge consists of realisation of Brahman says the Vedāntin, (2) according to the Sankhya it consists in discrimination between Matter and Spirit, (3) the Nyāya view is that it consists in the recognising of the Soul as eternal as distinguished from the non eternal things Body, Sense organs etc etc

† The *Tātparya* after having criticised the other views sums up the Nyaya view thus —It is because the notion of 'I' consists in regarding as *Soul* the Body etc which are *not Soul*, that people have such hopes as 'may I not cease to be may I continue to live'. Such ideas come to only such men as regard the Body etc as their 'Soul', and never to one who knows the real character of the Soul as different from Body etc. This latter man looks upon his Body as the snake does upon its cast-off slough, and so does not feel attached to it and does not fear separation from it

Answer —When a man looks upon the Body etc as 'this is I', he regards their destruction as *his own* destruction, so that he becomes imbued with a longing for the non destruction of those, and thus becomes equipped with them over and over again and he thus becoming equipped with them, all his efforts tend to bring for him births and deaths, so that not being freed from these, he is never released. On the other hand the man who looks upon Pain, Receptacle of Pain (Body) and Pleasure intermingled with Pain,—on all these things as 'Pain'—he is the man who knows the real nature of 'Pain' and when this 'Pain' has been duly recognised (in its true nature) it is not embraced by the man (as something desirable), and so comes to be dropped, just like poisoned food. This man comes to look upon 'Defects' and 'Action' also as sources of pain, and until the Defects have been removed, there is no possibility of cessation of the continuity of Pains hence the man renounces the 'defects', and when the 'defects have been renounced Activity does not lead to 'Rebirth'—as has already being explained (under Su 4-1 64)

Thus the man comes to the conclusion that 'Rebirth', 'Fruition', and 'Pain are things to be known, and that 'Action' and 'Defects are things to be abandoned, Final Release' is a thing to be attained, and True Knowledge is the means of attaining it. Thus when the man attends to repeatedly looks upon and ponders over, the 'objects of cognition as grouped under the aforesaid four categories [(1) things mistaken as 'Soul, viz Body etc (2) things to be known viz 'Rebirth' etc (3) things to be renounced, viz Defects and Action, and (4) things to be attained, viz 'Release']—there comes to him right perception,—i.e. the cognition of things in their real character, i.e. True Knowledge.

It is with a view to the above that we have the following *Sūtra*

Sūtra 1

From the True Knowledge of the 'Cause of Defects' follows the cessation of the notion of 'I'—

BIĀŚYA

The 'objects of cognition' beginning from 'Body' and ending with 'Pain' [i.e. Body Sense organs, Objects of Perception, Appre-

hension, Mind, Activity, Defects, Rebirth, Fruition and Pain] are called the 'Cause of Defects', because these are what form the subjects of *wrong notions*,—hence when the 'True Knowledge' of these comes about, it sets aside the notion of 'I' in regard to them; for the True Knowledge of the said things (which are not the Soul, which alone can be rightly spoken of as 'I') is incompatible with the notion of 'I' in regard to those same things. Thus when True Knowledge has been attained, *'there is a cessation of each member of the following series—Pain, Birth, Activity, Defect and Wrong Notion,—the cessation of that which follows bringing about the annihilation of that which precedes it, and this ultimately leads to Final Release'* (Su 1-1-2)

Thus we find that this brief statement of the main doctrine of philosophy is only a re-assertion (of what has been stated already under Su 1-1-2), and it is not meant to put forward any new doctrine

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The order in which this True Knowledge is to be attained is as follows *

Sūtra 2

Colour and other objects, when they form the subjects of wrong notion, become the cause of Defects †

BHĀṢYA

Such objects of Sense perception as form the objects of desire are spoken of here as 'Colour and other objects', when these are wrongly conceived, they set going Attachment, Hatred and Illusion. Hence it is these objects that the man should seek to know (and understand in their true character) first of all. When the man knows the true character of these, his wrong notions in

* Purī Ms B reads प्रसख्यानानुपूर्वा, which gives better sense

† It has been declared that one should set aside the notion of 'I' in regard to the Body etc. which are not-Soul. Now the Sūtra proceeds to describe with which of these latter the process should begin and since the process is much easier in regard to external objects the Sūtra begins with these. '*Prasaṅghyāna*' means true knowledge resulting from contemplation'—*Tātparyā*

† '*Saṅkalpa* is explained by the *Tātparyā* as meaning 'wrong notion'. Viśvanātha specifies it further as the notion that 'these are good and desirable things'

regard to Colour etc., disappear. When these have disappeared, then he should seek to know the things related to the Soul, such as the Body and the rest. When the knowledge of these has been attained, the notion of 'I' in regard to things related to the Soul ceases forthwith. Thus, the man, acting with his mind wholly unattached, either to external objects or to objects related to the Soul, comes to be called 'released'.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The author next proceeds to instruct us as to the propriety of our ignoring certain aspects of things and pondering over certain others, and the next Sūtra has got nothing to do with either the proving or the disproving of things (as some people have supposed).

"What is this instruction?"

Sūtra 3

Regard for the object as a whole becomes the cause of Defects.

BHĀṢYA

The regard or admiration for the object as a whole brings about Defects. For instance (in connection with sexual love), for the Male, the conceiving of the Female as such, becomes a source of bondage, and for the Female the conceiving of the Male as such becomes a source of bondage*. And there are two aspects in which the object (Male or Female) can be conceived of—(1) the aspect of organs, and (2) the figurative or poetical aspect.

The 'aspect of organs' pertains to the teeth and the lips, the eyes and the nose, one by one, and the 'figurative aspect' pertains to the teeth or the lips, being 'so and so beautiful'. All this three fold aspect intensifies Desire and its attendant Defects all which have to be avoided. The avoidance of the said object of love is to be done by conceiving of it in the terms of its limbs, —e.g., by conceiving of the Female as only made up of hairs, bristles, flesh, blood, bone, tendons, arteries, phlegm, bile, ordure and so forth. This is what is called the 'disagreeable aspect' (of the thing). When one ponders over this aspect of the thing, his desire and attachment for it cease.

* In translating 'parikṣā' as 'bondage' we have followed the Vārtika which says—*parikṣā bandhanam*.

Thus then we find that there being two aspects (agreeable and disagreeable) of each object, there is one aspect (the agreeable) which should be ignored, while the other (the disagreeable) should be pondered over. This is what is taught here. Just as in the case of the poisoned food, while the food-aspect is meant to be acquired, the poison aspect is to be avoided.*

End of Section (1)

SECTION (2)

Sūtras 4-17

Dealing with Components and Composites

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Now the Idealist, with a view to deny the Object, proceeds to deal with (and demolish) the 'Composite' †

Sūtra 4

"Apprehension and Non-apprehension being two fold, there arises doubt"

BHĀṢYA

"Since there is apprehension of existent as well as non-existent things, Apprehension is of two kinds, and since there is non-apprehension of existent as well as non-existent things, non-apprehension also is of two kinds §. So that if we apprehend

* The *Parisuddhi* remarks — As a matter of fact, for one who seeks after Release, all things of the World, in all their aspects, are equally to be avoided, and are equally evil, — yet the author speaks of the two 'aspects' in regard to the ordinary Man of the World, who becomes desirous of Release only after having gone through a life of enjoyment.

† Says the *Tatparjya* — The Idealist proceeds to deal with the Composite for the purpose of demolishing it. The conceptions spoken of under the preceding Sūtra are possible only when there is an object composed of several component parts. But since there is no such object, how can there be any such conceptions? It is with this view that the Idealist *Turiyapakṣa* proceeds to demolish the Composite and this we shall follow with the denial of the Atom. So that the Composite and the Component Atom being both demolished, Idea would be the only thing left.

On this the *Parisuddhi* — Some people have tried to get rid of the entire fabric of Instruction expounded under the preceding Sūtra by denying the Composite, in the absence whereof none of the conceptions described above are possible.

§ There is apprehension of the existent thing when we see water in the tank, there is also apprehension of the non-existent thing when we perceive

the Composite, there is doubt, since Apprehension is of both kinds,—on the other hand, if we do not apprehend the Composite, then also there is doubt, since non apprehension also is of both kinds. Thus then, whether the Composite is apprehended, or not apprehended,—in either case it does not become free from doubt."

Sūtra 5

There can be no doubt (in regard to the Composite), as its existence has been established by reasons already explained before.

BHĀṢYA

No doubt is possible (in regard to the Composite),—why? because the reasons already explained before (under Su 2-1-33 *et seq*) have not been refuted, so that it remains established that there is such a thing as the Composite arising out of, and distinct from, the Components

Sūtra 6

[Objection]—"In that case, (we might as well say that), since the existence (of any such thing as the Composite) is impossible, there can be no doubt (as to whether it exists or not)"*

BHĀṢYA

"No doubt is possible. That is, there certainly is no such thing as the Composite. This is further explained (in the next Sūtra)"

Sūtra 7

[Objection continued]—"Inasmuch as the components cannot reside either in the whole or in a part (of the Composite), it follows that there is no Composite"†

water in the mirage. There is non apprehension of the existent thing when we do not perceive long buried treasure, and there is non apprehension of the non existent thing when we do not perceive the absent jar. So that whether we apprehend the Composite whole or not, there is doubt as to its existence or non existence.—*Tatparya*

* This Sūtra is not found in the *Purī* Su. Ms. The *Nyāyamañibandha* has omitted it.

† Sūtras 7 and 8 are not in *Viśvanātha*, nor in any Sū. Ms. They are found in the *Nyāyamañibandha* and *Viśvanātha* also says that they have been regarded as Sūtras. From the *Bhāṣya*—'eod' *śiḥajāt*' also it would appear that they are "Sūtra".

BHĀṢYA

"As a matter of fact, each single *component* cannot reside in the entire *Composite*; (1) because both are not of the same dimension, and (2) because, in that case, there would be no connection between the *Composite* and the other *components*. Nor can the *component* reside in only a part of the *Composite*, for the simple reason that the *Composite* has no 'parts' apart from the *Components* "

"If (in order to escape from this difficulty) it be held that it is the *Composite* that subsists in the *Components* (and not the *Components* in the *Composite*),—[then our answer is as given in the following *Sūtra*] "

Sūtra 8

[*Objection continued*]—"Inasmuch as it is not possible (for the *Composite*) to reside in them,—there can be no *Composite* "

BHĀṢYA

"(a) The entire *Composite* cannot reside in each one of the *Components*,—because they are of different sizes; and further, because in this manner the (*Composite*) object would consist of a single component substance [and as such it would have to be regarded as eternal, which is absurd] (b) Nor can the *Composite* subsist in *parts* in all the *components*, as it has no other parts (except those same components) "

"From all this it follows that it is not right to entertain any doubts (as to whether the *Composite* exists or not),—the conclusion doubtless is that there does not exist any such thing as the *Composite* "

Sūtra 9

[*Objection continued*]—"And since the *Composite* cannot reside apart from the *Components* (there can be no such thing as the *Composite*) " "

* Viśvanātha notices three interpretations of this *Sūtra* —(1) As in the *Bhāṣya* (2) The *Composite* could not subsist apart from the *Components*, as in that case it would be non-existent;—(3) For reasons given in the preceding *Sūtra* the *Composite* could have no existence even apart from the *Components*, hence it does not exist at all

BHĀṢYA

* "There can be no such thing as the 'Composite'—These words have to be brought in from the preceding *Sūtra*. The Composite cannot reside apart from the Components,—(1) because it is not so perceived, and (2) because in that case it would be eternal. For these reasons it follows that there is no such thing as the Composite."

Sūtra 10

[*Objection continued*].—"Lastly, the Composite cannot be the same as the Components."

BHĀṢYA

"The Composite cannot be regarded as a mere quality of the Components,—why?—because, as shown above, there can be no connection of the said quality with the *qualified* Components, and apart from the *qualified* Components, the quality is never perceived, this last argument being the same as that urged before (in the preceding *Sūtra*)."

Sūtra 11

[*Answer*].—From the standpoint of the *Siddhānta*—Inasmuch as there is no diversity in what is one only, terms connoting diversity cannot be applied to it, so that there is no room for the question put by the *Pūrvapakṣin* §

BHĀṢYA

There is no room for the question—"Does the Composite reside in the Components in its entirety, or only in parts?"—[as

*The correct reading of the *Bhāṣya* on this *Sūtra* is found in *Purāṇa* B अवयवभावे इति वर्तते । न चावयवभावेनैव वर्तते, अपहणत् नित्यत्व-प्रसङ्गात् । तस्मादात्मवयवोक्तिः ।

† This *Sūtra* is directed against those persons who have held the following view—"The Composite is only a quality of the Components, and it is neither absolutely different from them, nor absolutely non-different, it is both different and non-different from them."

§ The *Pratīka* remarks that there are two parts of the *Pūrvapakṣa*—(1) Do the Components subsist in the Composite? and (2) If the Composite subsists in the Components, does it do so in its entirety, or in parts? The (1) is ignored by the *Sūtrākāra* for the simple reason that no Logician acknowledges the subsistence of the Component (cause) in the Composite (Effect).

Hence it is only the (2) that is answered by the *Siddhānta* in this *Sūtra*.

put by the Purvapākṣin under Su 7 *et seq*]—Why?—Because *inasmuch as there is no diversity in what is one only, terms connoting diversity cannot be applied to it*. As a matter of fact, the term 'kṛtsna', 'entire', connotes *all members of a group consisting of several individuals*, and the term 'ekadesa', 'a part', connotes *a few individuals out of several*, so that both these terms, 'entire' and 'in part' are connotative of *diversity*, and as such they cannot be applied to the *Composite* which, being a single entity, is devoid of diversity.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Further, the Purvapākṣin has argued that—'The Composite cannot reside in parts in the Components, because it has no other 'parts' (apart from the Components)'—but this is not right reasoning.

Sūtra 12

Even if there were other parts (of the Composite),* it could not subsist (in the Components), hence the reasoning is not right.

[In support of the proposition that the Composite cannot subsist in the Components, or in its parts] the Opponent has propounded the reason "because the Composite has no other parts" but † even if 'parts' of the Composite were actually other than its Component, the meaning (of the Composite subsisting *in part* in the Components) would be that one part or Component subsists in another part or Component,—and not that the Composite subsists in them. If the Composite be accepted as being something different (from the Components), then,—even though it had 'parts' other than its Components it would not mean the subsisting of the Composite and hence it would not mean that it is *in parts* that the Composite subsists in the Components,—so that there can be no force in the reasoning—' be-

* The *Viz* text reads अवयवान्तरभावे as also Viśvanātha, Puri Bhaṭṭa Ms Iuri Sū Ms and Śu Ms C But Śu Ms D the *Nyāyanandandha* and the *Tātparyā* read अवयवान्तरभावे. Mss of the *Īrtika* contain both. In view, however, of the explanation given in the *Bhāṭya* अवयवान्तरभावे should be accepted as the right reading.

† अवयवान्तरभूतम् does not give good sense. Puri Ms B reads अवयवान्तरभूत which gives better sense.

cause it has no parts apart from the Components (the Composite subsists in parts in the Components) ”

Question —“ What is the meaning then of the *subsisting* (of the Composite in the Components) ? ”

Answer —What it means is that there is *co existence* (juxta position), consisting in the relation of container and contained, between the one (Composite) and the many (Components)

“ What is the meaning of the *relation of container and contained* ? ”

It means that when between two things it is found that one can have no existence apart from the other, the latter is called the ‘ container ’, and as a matter of fact the Product can have no existence apart from its constituent cause but this is not the case with the constituents (which may exist apart from the product) [So that what is meant by the Composite subsisting in the Components is that it cannot exist apart from these latter]

“ But how can this be so in the case of eternal things (which have no cause) ? ”

In their case we infer it from what we perceive in the case of non eternal things. What you mean to ask is—‘ how can there be the relation of container and contained in the case of eternal things ? ’—and our answer is that when we perceive in the case of non eternal things—substances and qualities—the relation of container and contained we infer from this that similar relation exists in the case of eternal things also

From all that has gone before (under Sūtras 4 12) it follows that what has been prohibited (under Sū 3)—for the benefit of the person seeking after the highest good—is the *having of regard for objects as a whole*, and it does not mean that there is no such thing as the Composite, just as in regard to Colour etc. what has been prohibited is the *wrong notion* of them, and the existence of Colour etc., themselves has not been denied

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Under Sū 2-1-34 the *Siddhāntin* has put forward, in proof of the existence of the Composite, the argument that—‘ if there were no Composite, there would be non apprehension of all things ’, and even though he has been answered by this, the *Pūrvapakṣin* re asserts his contention [having been reminded of the previous arguments by the reference to them in Sū 4 2 5] —

Sūtra 13

" The perception of things would be possible , just like the perception of the mass of hairs by the person of dim vision "

BHĀṢYA

" As a matter of fact, we find that the man whose vision is dimmed does not perceive each single hair , and yet he does perceive the mass of hair , similarly though each single Atom may not be perceived, yet it would be quite possible to perceive a mass of atoms . Thus the perception that we have of things (and which the Siddhāntin has put forward as inexplicable except by the assuming of the *Composite* as apart from the component atoms) really pertains to the *masses of Atoms* (and not to any such thing as the Composite) "

Sūtra 14

The efficiency (distinctness) and dulness (indistinctness) of the perception is due to the efficiency and dulness of the sense organs but these never go beyond the range of their respective objectives and they cannot operate upon what is not their objectives

BHĀṢYA

This efficiency and dulness of the Sense organs are in reference only to their respective objectives , and it is from this that there follows the distinctness and indistinctness of the perceptions . That is, however efficient the Visual Organ may become, it can never apprehend *odour* which is not the special object of visual perception and however dull it may become it cannot fail to apprehend its own object . Now (turning to the case cited by the Opponent) there may be some person who, having his vision dimmed, does not perceive the hair singly , while he does perceive the *mass* of hair and yet both (the single hair and the mass of hair) are perceived by the person whose vision is not dimmed [But in all cases the man's eyes apprehend the Hair, either singly or in mass, which is an object perceptible through that organ] . Atoms on the other hand, are beyond the reach of the sense organs , they never become objects of perception through the organs, they are never apprehended by any sense-organ,—under the circumstances, if the *Mass of Atoms* were perceived, (through sense-organs) it would mean that

the organs have operated upon something which is not their object at all, for (according to the Opponent) there is no other object except Atoms (and Atoms are absolutely imperceptible) So that what the Opponent asserts (in Su 13) comes to mean that when the Atoms, being massed, become perceived, they renounce their imperceptibility,—and when being disjoined, they fail to be perceived, they cease to be objects of perception through the sense organs. All this would be entirely absurd, except on the supposition that a new object is produced (when the Atoms become massed) From all this it follows that what forms the object of perception is an object distinct (from the component Atoms),

It might be urged that 'what forms the object of perception is merely the mass (of the Atoms themselves)' But this would not be right, for 'Mass' is only of the nature of *conjunction* combination, and the *conjunction* of things that are themselves imperceptible can never be perceived, hence the explanation propounded would be highly improper. As a matter of fact, the 'Mass' is only *the conjunction or combination of several things*, and when we perceive a conjunction—as that 'this thing is in conjunction with that thing',—it is only the conjunction of things that are themselves perceptible, and never that of things beyond the reach of sense organs,—hence the explanation put forward cannot be right. Further in the case of things perceptible through the sense organs, if they fail to be perceived, there is always found some thing, in the shape of an obstruction, that serves to prevent the perception [and we do not find any such thing as should prevent our perceiving of the Atoms, if they were perceptible] It follows from all this that the non perception of single Atoms cannot be due to the inefficiency of the sense organs, just as the non apprehension of Odour etc, through the Eye cannot be due to the inefficiency of that organ

Sutra 15

The difficulties in connection with Composites and Components would continue till the total negation of all things

BHĀŚYA

* The Opponent has pointed out difficulties in the way in which the Composite may subsist in its Components, and has, on that ground, denied the existence of the Composite. But the

components (the pieces that go to make up the Jar, e.g.) also have their own component parts, and the said difficulties would be applicable to the way in which the Component may subsist in its own component parts, so that, these difficulties should either lead us to deny the existence of all things, or they would lead us on and on to the mere Atom, which has no component parts,—and either of these contingencies would mean that there does not exist anything that could be the object of perception, (the Atoms being imperceptible),—and in the absence of all objects of perception, there could be no Perception,—and yet the denial of the subsistence of the Composite in its Components is supposed to be based upon facts of ordinary perception. Thus, when this denial (of the subsistence of the Composite etc.) ultimately leads to the denial of its very basis (in the form of Perception), it must be regarded as striking at its own very roof. [Hence the fact urged by the *Siddhāntin* under Su 2-1-34, remains, that if there is no Composite there can be no Perception at all.]

Sūtra 16

But as a matter of fact —

The total denial of all things cannot be right for the Atom remains

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, however, the (Opponent's) denial of things based upon the difficulties in connection with the subsistence of components and their parts, would cease at the Atom, it cannot lead to the total denial of all things. Because the Atom has no component parts, and difficulties based upon the dividing of things into their component parts must end at the thing than which there is nothing smaller. For instance, when we proceed to divide a clod of earth, into parts, we get at smaller and smaller particles, and this division must come to an end at that piece than which there could be no smaller piece, and which is (on that account) the smallest piece possible, and it is that very thing than which there is nothing smaller which we call 'Atom'.*

* It is only for the sake of argument that the two contingencies have been put forward in the preceding Sūtra. It is now shown that the denial of the Composite can lead only to the postulating of the Atom, and as this is imperceptible, the *Purvapakṣa* view would do away with all Perception as urged by the *Siddhāntin*, under Su 2-1-34.

Sūtra 17

Or [the Atom may be defined as] that which is beyond the Diad

BHĀṢYA

As according to the Purvapakṣa (a) there would be no end to the division of things into their component particles, and (b) all things would come to consist of equally innumerable component substances,—there could be no such thing as the *Diad* *

End of Section (2)

SECTION (3)

(Sūtras 18-25)

Regarding the Atom being without parts

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The Nihilist, holding the view that 'all things are non-existent', urges the following argument† —

Sūtra 18

[Objection]—“There can be no such thing (as the indivisible Atom), as it is surely permeated by Ākāśa”

BHĀṢYA

‘There can be no such thing as the impartite eternal Atom, —Why?—Because it is surely permeated by Ākāśa both inside and outside the Atom must be surrounded by Ākāśa permeated

* The term *trist* literally dismemberment has come to mean the Diad. The point is that unless some end is postulated in the process of division all things would consist of equally innumerable particles which would mean that the mountain is of the same size as the grain of sand.

† The theory of the whole world emanating from the Void has been disposed of under Sūtras 4 1 14 to 1” The hypothesis taken up now is that all is mere Void. And in course of the refutation of this hypothesis the Author proceeds to show that there do exist certain things that are devoid of parts this subject being a natural sequence to the conclusion arrived at in the foregoing section that there is such a thing as the *Composite* composed of Component parts.

Uśvanātha introduces the section with the following remarks—The present section is introduced with a view to establish the existence of the impartite Atom, in answer to the view that the world being a Void there can be no such thing as the Atom on which the whole argument of the Siddhānta in the foregoing section is based.

by it ; and being so permeated, it must be made up of parts ; and being made up of parts, it must be non-eternal ”*

Sūtra 19

“Or else, Ākāśa would be not all-pervading ”

BHĀṢYA

“ If it is not admitted (that the Atom is permeated by Ākāśa), then it would mean that there is no Ākāśa inside the Atom , so that Ākāśa would cease to be all-pervading ”

Sūtra 20

[Answer]—Inasmuch as the terms ‘ inside ’ and ‘ outside ’ are denotative of other constituent causes of the Product,—they cannot apply to the case of the Atom, which is not a ‘ product ’

BHĀṢYA

When one uses the term ‘ inside ’ (in regard to an object), it stands for that constituent (part) of it which is hidden (from view) by other constituents , and the term ‘ outside ’ is applied to that constituent (part) which hides the others , and which it self is not hidden (from view) And [since both these terms are applied to parts or *constituent causes*], these can apply only to such objects as are *products* , they can never apply to the Atom, because it is not a *product* , the Atom not being a *product*, the terms ‘ inside ’ and ‘ outside ’ cannot apply to it , and the object to which these terms are really applicable is only a *product (composed) of the Atom*, and not the Atom itself , because the Atom is the name of that than which there is nothing smaller

Sūtra 21

It is by reason of the pervasion of Sound and of Conjunctions, that Ākāśa is regarded to be all-pervading †

* The real point of this objection, as the *Tātparya* points out, is that if the Atom is made up of parts, its existence will be open to the same difficulties as those that have been shown to beset any ordinary Composite, so that the inevitable conclusion could only be that the Atom is as non-existent as an ordinary thing —and that *nothing is existent, all is Void*

† The *Tātparya* expounds the compound in both ways—(1) Pervasion of Sound and of Conjunctions, and (2) Pervasion of the Conjunctions of Sounds*. The *Bhāṣya* has adopted the former.

The Vartika reads the *Sūtra* as सर्वसंयोगे etc

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, Sounds, that are produced anywhere, are found to pervade in *Ākāśa*, and subsist in it,—similarly the conjunctions that take place,—with Minds, with Atoms, and with their products,—are also found to pervade in *Ākāśa*, not a single corporeal object is ever found to be disjoined from *Ākāśa*. From these two facts it follows that *Ākāśa* cannot but be *all-pervading*.

Sūtra 22

'Absence of Transfigurations', 'Unobstructiveness' and 'All-pervasiveness' are the properties of *Ākāśa*.*

BHĀṢYA

There is no *transfiguration* (or displacement) caused in *Ākāśa* by things moving in it or striking against it, as there is in Water by the piece of wood passing through it,—and what is the reason for this?—the reason for this lies in the fact that *Ākāśa* is not made up of parts. Secondly, *Ākāśa* offers no obstruction to things moving in it or striking against it, that is, it does not counteract that quality of the thing which causes its motion,—and why is this so?—It is because *Ākāśa* is not tangible. It is only under contrary conditions,—i.e., in the case, of such objects as are made up of parts and are tangible,—that we find obstruction; and certainly you cannot attribute it to a substance where these conditions are not present.

Further, the character of 'product' must be denied to the Atom, because it would mean that the component parts of the Atom are smaller than the Atom, if the Atom were made up of parts, these parts should be smaller than the Atom,—why?—because it is always found that there is a difference of size between the Cause and its Product, it is for this reason that the parts of the Atom would have to be smaller than the Atom, as the Atom that is made up of component parts must be a

* This Sūtra anticipates the following objection—If *Ākāśa* is really all-pervading, as asserted under the foregoing Sūtra, then it should offer obstruction to things moving in it, and it should undergo changes in its shape by such objects, as we find in the case of water, as no such phenomena are found to take place, *Ākāśa* cannot be all-pervading.

The sense of the reply is that this reasoning would be all right, if *Ākāśa* also, like Water, were made up of parts, and tangible.

Product * It is for this reason that we deny the fact of the Atom being a Product

Lastly, the *non-eternality* of products is due to the dismemberment of its constituent cause, and not to 'permeation by *Ākāśa*' (as held by the Opponent, in Su 4 2-18) e.g., when the clod of earth is destroyed, it is so by reason of the dismemberment of its component parts, and not by the entering into it of *Ākāśa*

Sūtra 23

[The *Nihīlist*].—"But the Atom must be made up of component parts, because it is only corporeal objects that have shape "

BHĀṢYA

"As a matter of fact, shape belongs to only such things as are limited and tangible,—such shapes as triangular, rectangular, square, and globular, and this 'shape' is only a particular arrangement of component parts.—Atoms also are endowed with the globular *shape*, hence these must be made up of component parts "†

Sūtra 24

"Also because they are capable of conjunction [Atoms must be made up of component parts] "

BHĀṢYA

"When an Atom comes between two other Atoms and becomes conjoined to them, it brings about separation between them, and from this separation it is inferred that the intervening Atom is conjoined, in its forepart, with the Atom lying behind it, and, in its aft parts, with the Atom appearing in front of it, and these fore and aft parts are the 'component parts' of the Atom. Similarly when the Atom becomes conjoined in all its parts, it must be regarded as having component parts all over "

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The *Bhāṣya* answers the arguments of the *Nihīlist* as follows]—

* The right reading for शुक्लार्थतन् is शुक्लार्थतन्.

† The *Īrtika* and *Viśvanātha* construe the Sūtra as propounding two reasons —'The Atom must be made up of components —(a) because it is corporeal and (b) because it has shape '

Consequently these cannot set aside the fact of Atoms being impartite

Further, as a matter of fact, it is possible for the division of an object to completely destroy that object, hence it is not possible to carry on the process of division till the disappearance of the object

If there were an *infinite regress* (such as is involved in the Opponent's arguments), it would mean that in every object there are endless component substances, so that (a) there should be no conception either of diverse dimensions, or of gravity,—and (b) after the dismemberment of the component parts of the Atom, the Composite and the Component would have to be regarded as of equal dimension

End *ection* (3)

SECTION (4)

(Sūtras 26-37)

Refutation of the Denial of the External World

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The Bauddha Idealist says]—‘ You take your stand upon Cognitions, and then go on to assert that the objects of these Cognitions exist, but all these Cognitions are wrong notions. If these were right notions, then alone could the proper examination of Cognitions enable us to form an idea of and comprehend the real character of their objects *

Sūtra 26

[*Purvapakṣa*]—‘ As a matter of fact, however, when we come to analyse things by our reason, we fail to apprehend their real character, and this non apprehension must be like the non apprehension of the ‘ cloth ’ after the yarns have been abstracted ”†

* The foregoing two sections have proved that all ordinary things are made up of component parts and that the Atom is not so made up —we are now led on to discuss the question as to whether or not external objects exist. It is only when external things exist that there can be any occasion for considering whether or not they are composites.

† Cf. *Bauddhakarika*—मुद्रया निविच्यमानानां स्वभावो नावधार्यते ।

अतो निरमिल्यस्ते निस्स्वभावाश्च कर्तव्याः ॥

Satish Ch. Vidyābhūṣana finds in this Sūtra an echo of the *Mādhyamika*

BHĀṢYA

"When we come to analyse each yarn in the Cloth,—as 'this is a yarn', 'this is another yarn', and so forth,—we fail to perceive in it anything else besides the yarns, which could be the real object of the notion of 'Cloth', and since we do not perceive things as they are ordinarily conceived of, it follows that no such things (as the Cloth) exist, so that the Cloth being non-existent, if there is a notion of 'Cloth' it must be a wrong notion, similarly with all things"*

Sūtra 27

[Siddhānta]—The reason propounded is invalid, as it involves self contradiction

BHĀṢYA

If an 'analysis' of things by reason is possible, then it is not true that the real nature of things is not apprehended, if, on the other hand, the real nature of things is not apprehended, then there can be no analysis or scrutiny of things by reason. So that to allege, that "there is analysis of things by reason—and the real nature of things is not apprehended" involves a contradiction in terms. We have explained all this under Sū 4 2 1, where it has been pointed out that—the difficulties in connection with Composites and Components would continue till the total negation of things†

Sūtra 28

The non-apprehension (of the whole) apart (from its parts) is due to the fact that it subsists in these

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, the Product subsists is contained, in its Causes, it is for this reason that it is not apprehended apart from these latter, there is separate apprehension only when the contrary happens to be the case, that is two things are separately apprehended only when one is not contained in the other

* There is no Cloth apart from the yarns there is no yarn apart from its parts, and so on up to Atoms of Atoms also we cannot perceive the real character. Hence from Atom upwards no Object exists

† When the real nature of a thing is not comprehended how can there be analysis of it by reason? [As regards the analysis of things put forward by the Opponent under the preceding Sūtra] the process of analysing must end at a certain point, if it did not then the Diad would become immeasurable, etc etc etc as pointed out before—Tatp 33a

Then again, the analysis of things by reason does lead to the distinct apprehension of things,—as is found in the case of Atoms which are imperceptible, that is, that which is perceived by the senses, when it comes to be analysed, is surely recognised as different (from the *imperceptible* Atoms) *

Sutra 29

In reality, things are cognised by means of the Instruments of Right Cognition †

BHĀṢYA

When things are analysed by reason, what sort of apprehension of the real nature of things we have, and how we have it,—and also what sort of apprehension we do not have and how we do not have it,—all this is known through what we can cognise by means of the Instruments of Right Cognition. In fact, the very 'analysis of things by reason' consists of what is cognised by means of the Instruments of Right Cognition, as it is only such cognitions that pervade through all scriptures and all actions, as also all activities of living beings. It is only when one comes to examine things by his reason that he comes to determine that a certain thing exists and another thing does not exist. And such an examination or analysis does not warrant the conclusion that nothing exists‡

Sutra 30

By reason of the possibility and impossibility of proofs [the *Pūroapaksa* allegation becomes untenable]

BHĀṢYA

Under the circumstances, the allegation "nothing exists" is untenable—Why?—By reason of the possibility and impossibility

* In the case of ordinarily perceptible composites and components—where both are perceptible, e.g. the cloth and the yarns—it may be difficult to apprehend the composite as distinct from its parts. But when it comes to the composite thing whose components are atoms the distinct apprehension becomes quite easy, the composite being perceptible while the component is not perceptible.—*Tatparya*

† This Sutra is meant to show that even in the case of ordinary things, where the composite and its components are both perceptible we do have the distinct apprehension of things in their real character.—*Tatparya*

‡ The *Tatparya* construes this last sentence with the following Sutra. It appears better to construe it with the foregoing *Bhāṣya*. The connection of the next Sutra follows from its very construction.

of proofs That is, if proof is available in support of the allegation that "nothing exists", then the allegation becomes self condemned —If, on the other hand, no proof is available in support of the allegation, how can it be established? If it can be established without proofs, then why cannot the assertion "all things exist" be regarded as established?

Sūtras 31-32

[The Idealist objects to what has been said in Sū 30]—

"The notion of reality in regard to the 'Instruments of Right Cognition' and 'objects cognised' (by means thereof) is similar to the notion of the reality of dreams and the objects dreamt of, (Sū 31)—or, it may be likened to the notions of reality in regard to Magical phenomena imaginary cities in the Air, and the Mirage

BHĀṢYA

"In Dreams, no objects are existent and yet we have the notion of reality in regard to them, similarly neither 'Instruments of Cognition' nor 'Objects of Cognition' are really existent, yet we have the notion of reality in regard to 'Instruments of Cognition' and 'objects cognised' by means thereof [And it is not so in Dreams only, in the waking condition also, we have several such notions of reality in regard to things not really existent, e.g., magical phenomena etc., etc.]"

Sūtra 33

[Answer]—Since there is no reason (in support of it), the Proposition (of the Opponent) cannot be regarded as established

BHĀṢYA

As a matter of fact, there is no reason in support of the view that "the notion of 'Instruments' and 'Objects' of Cognition are like the notion of reality in regard to things dreamt of, and it is not like the cognition of things during the waking state",—and since there is no such reason, the Proposition cannot be regarded as established. In fact, there is no reason to show that what are cognised during dreams are non-existent things—"Inasmuch as things dreamt of are not perceived when the man wakes up, (they must be regarded as non-existent)"—[According to this reasoning of yours] inasmuch as we do appre-

hend the things cognised during the waking state, the existence of these cannot be denied ; if, from the fact of our not apprehending, on waking, the things cognised in dreams, you infer that these things are not existent,—then it follows that the things that we do apprehend when awake, are *existent*, because they *are* apprehended, so that the reason you put forward in proof of the unreality of things dreamt of) is found to have the power of proving a conclusion contrary to your tenets. It is only when the existence of things can be inferred from their apprehension, that you can infer their non-existence from their non-apprehension*. And if under both circumstances (of dream as well as of waking) things were equally non-existent, then non-apprehension could have no power at all (of proving anything), when, for example, there is non-perception of Colour when the lamp is absent, what justifies our attributing the non-perception of Colour to the absence of the Lamp is the fact that the Colour is existent,† (and would have been perceived if the lamp were there)

Further, you have to show cause for the diversity that is found in dream-cognitions, e.g., one dream is beset with dread, another with joy, and yet another is devoid of both, while at times one does not dream of anything at all. According to the theory under which the dream cognitions are due to real causes, the said diversity can be explained as being due to the diversity in those causes §

Sūtra 34

Like Remembrance and Desire, the cognition of objects in dreams also—

* The right reading is उपलम्भान् सद्भावेति अनुपलम्भाद्भाव मिथ्यति as found in Puri B, and countenanced by the *Parīka*

† We can attribute the non perception of colour to the absence of the lamp only if we know that colour is existent and would have been perceived if the lamp were there. If all things were always,—during dreams as well as during the waking state—non-existent, then their non perception could not prove anything at all, as in that case we could have no such notion as that 'if it existed, it would have been perceived'.

§ This explanation cannot be available for the Idealist, for whom there is no real object at all

BHĀṢYA

has for its object something that has been previously apprehended (this has to be added to complete the Sutra) Just as Remembrance and Desire have for their objects previously apprehended things, and are incapable of lending support to the denial of the reality of such things,—so in dreams also the cognition of things has for its object things that have been previously apprehended, hence these also do not justify the notion that no such things exist. Thus in reality the Dream-cognition is always one that has its object previously perceived in the waking state, and when the sleeping man who has seen a dream wakes up, he recognises the dream cognitions as his own the idea in his mind being 'this is what I saw in my dream'. And it is only in relation to (and in comparison with) the said waking cognition that we come to the conclusion that the Dream-cognition is unreal. That is to say, when on waking one recognises the Dream cognition—as 'this is what I saw in my dream'—it is the recognition that leads him to the conclusion—'my cognition of things in the dream is unreal'. If there be no difference between the two, the proof becomes meaningless, that is, he for whom there is no difference (on the point of reality) between the waking and the dream cognition, for him the proof or reason,—that 'the notion of Instruments and Objects of Cognition is like the notions of things in a dream' (Su 31)—can have no meaning for he has denied the very basis of such an allegation the idea of a thing as what it is not (i. e. a wrong notion) is always based upon a real original (counterpart), e.g., the conception of the pillar, which is not man, as 'man' is always based upon a real original, i.e. until the original, the real man, has been perceived, one can have no conception of 'man' in regard to what is not man. Similarly the conception of things in a dream,—such as 'I have seen an elephant', 'I have seen a mountain',—can only rest on the basis of some real counterpart (the cognition of real elephants and mountains) *

Such being the case,—

* Unless one has had a previous cognition of the real object, he can have no wrong conceptions in regard to it

Sūtra 35

The destruction of Wrong Apprehension follows from True Knowledge, just as there is destruction of the conception of things during a dream, on waking

BHĀṢYA

When one has the conception of 'man' in regard to the Pillar, this is 'wrong apprehension',—being the apprehension of the thing as what it is not. whereas when, in regard to the Pillar one has the conception of 'pillar', this is 'True Knowledge';—and what is set aside by 'True Knowledge' is the wrong *Apprehension*, not the *Object*,—the generic character of 'object' being common to the Man and the Pillar*. Just as when the man wakes up, the cognition that he has set aside the *conception* of things that he had during the dream,—and not the 'object' in general. Similarly in the case of magical phenomena, imaginary cities and mirage, we have the cognition of things as what they are not, and these wrong apprehensions also are set aside, in the manner described above, by 'True Knowledge', which does not set aside the fact of the cognitions having some sort of an *objective counterpart*. As a matter of fact, in the case of magic etc., also, the Wrong Apprehension has always got some basis in reality, for what happens in what is called 'magic' is that the man equipped with the necessary appliances, takes up a real substance similar to that whose illusion he intends to produce, and in regard to this real substance, he brings about the wrong apprehension in another person.—in the case of the 'Imaginary City', what happens is that either Snow or some such real substance actually comes to assume the shape of a city, and hence, from a distance, people come to conceive of it as 'City', that this is what really happens is proved by the fact that the illusion does not appear when there is no such substance as the said Snow;—similarly again when the Sun's rays coming into contact with the heat radiating from the Earth's surface, begin to flicker, there arises the notion of 'water' in regard to it, by reason of the perception of the common quality of (flickering),

* When we subsequently come to recognise the pillar as 'pillar', all that this proves is that our former cognition of it was wrong *not* that the 'man' (as which the pillar had been formerly apprehended) is non-existent nor that the former cognition had no *objective counterpart* at all

that this is so is proved by the fact that when the man draws near, or when the Sun's rays are not there, there is no such illusion. Thus we find that in the case of every Wrong Apprehension there is some sort of real entity at the bottom somewhere, and no Wrong Apprehension is entirely baseless. We also find that there is a clear difference in the character of the two cognitions,—viz (a) that of the magician and his audience (the former regarding the magic phenomenon as *unreal*, and the latter believing it to be *real*) (b) that of the man at a distance and of one who is near at hand, the former regarding the 'imaginary city' and the 'miragic water' as *real*, while the latter has no idea of such things at all, and (c) that of the sleeping man and of the waking man. All this diversity would be inexplicable if everything were non-existent and as such entirely without any name or character.

Sūtra 36

[Having disposed of the Idealist, who, while denying the reality of the External World, admits the Idea,—the Author next takes up the Nihilist, who denies the Idea also]—In the same manner, the existence of the 'Apprehension' also (cannot be denied), because we actually perceive its cause, as also its real existence.

BHĀṢYA

Just as the existence of the 'object' of Wrong Apprehension cannot be denied, so that of the Apprehension itself cannot be denied,—why?—(a) because we actually perceive its cause, and (b) because we actually perceive its real existence, (a) as a matter of fact, we are actually cognisant of the cause of Wrong Apprehension; and (b) Wrong Apprehension also is found to appear in every person, and is actually cognised as such, being, as it is, distinctly cognisable. From all this it follows that Wrong Apprehension actually exists.

[And when even Wrong Apprehension is *real*, Right Apprehension is all the more so]

Sūtra 37

Wrong Apprehension has a double character, based upon the difference between the real object and the counterpart.*

* The Buddha argues that since the object of Wrong Apprehension is non-existent that of Right Apprehension also must be non-existent. This

BHĀṢYA

The 'real object' is the *Pillar*, and the 'counterpart' is the *Man*, and whenever there is a wrong apprehension of the *Pillar* as 'Man', both of these—the real object and the counterpart—are manifested in it quite distinctly, and the misapprehension is due to the perception of their common properties—similarly there is misapprehension of the *Flag* as a *line of cranes*, of a piece of *stone* as a *pigeon*. In fact, Wrong Apprehensions are possible only in regard to *similar* objects, because they are brought about by the perception of *common* properties (belonging to two or more similar objects) (For these reasons, he for whom everything is without name and form—according to such a person there can be no possibility (of Wrong Apprehension)

As regards Odour and such other objects of Cognition, the notion of 'Odour' etc., (i.e., of the things in their own character)—which would be regarded (by the Opponent) as Wrong Apprehension,—must, in fact, be regarded as *True Apprehension*, for the simple reason that in the case of these Cognitions, there are no two things involved—in the shape of the real object and its counterpart—nor is there the perception of any property common to two or more things

From all this it follows that the allegation that—"the conceptions of the Instruments and the Objects of Cognition are wrong"—is not right

End of Section

SECTION (5)

(*Sutras 38-49*)

The Development of True Knowledge

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

It has been said above that when there is True Knowledge of the causes of Defects, there follows the cessation of the notion of

is what the present *Sutra* traverses. The idea is that the object of Wrong Apprehension also is not entirely non-existent: What forms the object of Wrong Apprehension has a dual character—that of the real object 'Pillar' and also that of the counterpart 'Man', and though in the character of 'man' the object is *non-existent* it is really *existent* in the character of *Pillar*

'I Now the question arises—How is True Knowledge brought about ?*

Sūtra 38

[True Knowledge proceeds] from the practice of a particular form of meditation †

BHĀṢYA

When the Mind having been abstracted (withdrawn) from the Sense-organs, is kept steady by an effort tending to concentration,—the contact that takes place between this Mind and the Soul, and which is accompanied by a conscious eagerness to get at the truth, is what is called 'Meditation' § During this meditation, no cognitions appear in regard to the objects of the senses. From the practice of the said Meditation proceeds True knowledge

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[Objection]—"It has been said that during "*Meditation no cognitions appear in regard to the objects of the senses*," but—

* The reality of the External World and of Cognitions having been established, the Author reverts to what was said under Sūtras 4 2-1 *et seq* in connection with the causes of Defects where the process was described. This cannot be regarded as sufficient for the purposes of the enquirer as the True knowledge therein described cannot do away with such illusions and wrong apprehensions as are of the nature of Direct Apprehension — hence it becomes necessary to describe such True knowledge as may be of the character of Direct Apprehension—*Perinuddhi*

This is the particular form of 'True knowledge' that is referred to by the question with which the *Bhāṣya* introduces the Sūtra — *Vardhamana*

Vishvanātha adds—The knowledge produced by the Scriptures is momentary, like all cognitions, so that when it ceases to exist wrong notions would again continue to appear and entangle the Soul. Hence it becomes necessary to explain the process by which the said True knowledge may be developed and amplified and rendered capable of putting an end, once for all, to all possibility of wrong notions appearing again

† The exact reading of this Sūtra is uncertain. Sū. Ms D and *Vishvanātha* read as in the viz edition. Purī Sū Ms reads समाधिविशेषाभावात् (which is apparently wrong), the *Tatparya* reads समाधितत्वाभ्यासात्, though the *Nyayasūtrasbandha* reads as in the Viz edition. Sū Ms C however reads—तत्त्वज्ञानविवृद्धिस्तत्त्वज्ञानवासनात् (†) तदस्वात्मनित्यो निध्यागज्ञानात् ।

§ By 'concentration' is meant the keeping of the Soul within its own abode in the lotus of the heart. As such concentration is present also during deep sleep we have the additional qualification 'which is accompanied by etc'—which excludes Deep Sleep —*Tatparya* †

Sūtra 39

"This is not possible (A) Because certain objects are extremely powerful"—

BHĀṢYA

"In some cases, Cognitions *will* appear, even in the absence of any wish on the part of the person, so that what has been asserted cannot be right,—why?—*because certain objects are extremely powerful* As a matter of fact, we find that sometimes, even though the man has no wish for the cognising, the cognition does appear, as we find in the case of the thundering of the clouds and such things (which we cannot help hearing even against our wish) So that the said *particular kind of meditation* cannot be possible "

Sūtra 40

"(B) Also because Cognitions are brought about by Hunger etc "

BHĀṢYA

"Such things as Hunger and Thirst, Heat and Cold and Disease bring about cognitions even against our wish Hence no 'concentration (or one pointedness of the Mind) is possible "

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

It is possible that the man may renounce Meditation and become agitated, and there may also be causes tending to bring about such agitation as constitutes an obstacle to Meditation but even so—

Sūtra 41

Meditation would be brought about by the force of the fruit of what has been previously accomplished

BHĀṢYA

"What has been previously accomplished"—stands for the Merit and Wisdom, acquired in previous lives,—which serve to bring about True Knowledge —'Force of the fruit'—stands for the faculty born of Yogic practices, if there were no fruits of such practices people would never pay any heed to them, even in the case of ordinary worldly acts, we find that constant practice produces a certain faculty

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

It is for the removal of the obstacle (to Meditation) that—

Sūtra 42

there is the advice that Yoga should be practised in forests, caves and on river-banks

BHĀṢYA

The Merit produced by the practice of Yoga follows the Soul in other births also, and when the Merit that brings about True Knowledge has reached a high stage of development, and the Exercise of Meditation has assumed high proportions,—True Knowledge appears. We have actually found that Meditation serves to suppress the force of even powerful things, as for example, even the ordinary man says—‘My mind was elsewhere, I did not hear this,’ or ‘I did not know this.’

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[Says the Opponent]—“But if you admit the fact (urged in Su 39) that on account of the force of certain extremely powerful things, Cognitions appear even against the man’s wish—then,—

Sūtra 43

“this contingency would arise also upon Final Release”

“Even when the man has become released, it would be possible for Cognitions to appear, by reason of the force of external things.”

Sūtra 44

Not so. for Cognition is sure to appear only in the accomplished Body

BHĀṢYA

It is only when the Body,—as the receptacle of Activity, Sense-organs and Objects,—has been accomplished, under the influence of Karma (past deeds) that the presence of their cause makes the appearance of Cognitions sure to come about, so that however powerful the external object may be, it is not able to bring about Cognitions in the Soul, for the external object has been found to have that power (of bringing about Cognitions) only when it is in contact with a Sense-organ. [And no such contact is possible in the case of the person who has attained Final Release.]

Sūtra 45

And there is absence of that when Final Release has been attained.

BHĀṢYA

'That'—stands for the Body and the Sense organs, which contain the causes of cognition, and of this there is *absence* when Final Release has been attained, for the simple reason that there are no Merit and Demerit left (to bear fruition) Hence the allegation (in Su 43)—that "the contingency would arise also upon Final Release"—is not right

It is for this reason that Final Release consists of freedom from all kinds of pain, inasmuch as the root of all pain, and the receptacle of all pain,—i. e., the Body and the Sense-organs,—absolutely cease upon the attainment of Final Release, it follows that Final Release consists in absolute freedom from all pain, for without its root, and without its receptacle, no pain can appear

Sūtra 46

For that purpose (there should be) embellishment of the Soul, by means of restraints and observances and such other methods of internal discipline as may be learnt from the Science of Yoga.

BHĀṢYA

For the purpose of attaining Final Release, there should be '*embellishment of the Soul*'—'*Restraints*' are the means of acquiring merit, common to men in all Life-stages while '*Observances*' are peculiar to each Life stage '*Embellishment of the Soul*'—consists in the destruction of Demerit and accretion of Merit—'*Internal discipline*' should be learnt from the Science of Yoga, it consists of Penance, Controlling of the Breath Abstraction of the Mind, Contemplation and Concentration of the Mind, and the practice of the renouncing of objects of sense serves to remove attachment and hatred The other '*methods*' consist of the details of conduct laid down for Yoga [such as concentrating of the Mind, eating only particular kinds of food, not staying at one place for any length of time, and so forth]

Sūtra 47

[There should also be] repetition of the study of the Science, as also friendly discussion with persons learned in the Science

BHĀṢYA

'For that purpose' has to be construed with this *Sūtra* also. The term 'jñāna' stands for *that by which things are known*, *jñāyate anena* i.e., the Science of the Soul,—the 'grahara', 'study', of this consists in reading it and retaining it in the mind,—the 'repetition' of such study means the carrying on of it continuously, in the shape of reading it, listening to it (being expounded) and pondering over it—'Friendly discussion with persons learned in the Science'—is meant to bring about consolidation of the knowledge acquired, this 'consolidation' consists in—(1) the removing of doubts, (2) the knowing of things not already known, (3) the confirmation (by the opinions of the learned) of the conclusions already arrived at (by one's self),—the term 'samōda' means* 'samāya tadah', 'discussion for the sake of coming to an agreement' [i.e., friendly discussion].

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The expression 'friendly discussion with persons learned in the Science' (occurring in the preceding *Sūtra*) is vague, it is explained in the following *Sūtra*—

Sūtra 48

That (friendly discussion) should be carried on with the pupil, the teacher, companions in study, and other well-known learned persons,—who wish well (to the enquirer) and who are not jealous of him †

BHĀṢYA

The meaning of the *Sūtra* is explained by its own words

* The reading of the Viz. edition समारवाद gives no sense the right reading समाय वाद is supplied by the Paris Ms.

† The Commentators have explained 'sam' as referring to the 'person learned in the Science', 'abhyupēdāt as jñāyat, by this the *Sūtra* would mean that one should know the persons mentioned as learned in the Science.—Similarly 'īryyarthibhiḥ' they explain as meaning 'those that have faith in Final Release'. We have thought it best to deviate from this explanation. In the case of the former, it is not easy to construe the instrumental in दिव्यगुह्यसमग्रव्याख्यानविशिष्ट श्रेयोर्थिभि and as regards the latter, it is very much simpler, and more in keeping with the epithet 'Samarayāḥ', to take it in its natural sense 'those who wish well', as it is only such well-wishers whose intercourse can be entirely friendly and conducive to good.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

It might be thought that—the putting forward of theories and counter-theories would be unpleasant to the other party (the teacher and the rest) ; [with a view to this we have the following *Sūtra*.]—

Sūtra 49

Being a seeker (after truth) [the man should carry it on] for the accomplishment of his purpose, even without putting forward any counter-theories

' *He should carry on the discussion* ' (of the foregoing *Sūtra*) has to be construed here also. Inasmuch as the man is desirous of acquiring knowledge from the other person, he should simply express a desire to learn the truth, and thus without seeking to establish any theory of his own, he should clarify (correct) his own view of things,—specially by realising the fact that the doctrines of several philosophers are mutually contradictory [and from among these accepting what is right and rejecting what is wrong].

End of Section (5)

SECTION (6)

*(Sūtras 50—51)**The Guarding of True Knowledge*

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Through excessive partiality to their own theories, some people transgress all bounds of reasoning, in that case—

Sūtra 50

Disputation and Wrangling (should be carried on) for the purpose of defending one's own determination to get at the truth ; just as the hedge of thorny branches is put up for the protection of sprouting seeds

BHĀṢYA

This, however, is meant only for those persons who have not acquired True Knowledge, whose defects have not been entirely removed, and who are still making an attempt for those purposes.

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

When one has been rudely addressed by an Opponent, either through arrogance (of superior knowledge), or through sheer prejudice (against truth), or through some other similar reason (i.e., desire for wealth, fame etc.),—then he (failing to perceive the right answer to the ill-mannered allegations of the Opponent)—

Sūtra 51

should pick up a quarrel with him and proceed to deal with him by Disputation and by Wrangling.

BHĀṢYA

'Pick up a quarrel'—i.e. with a view to defeating the Opponent,—and not with a view to getting at the truth. But this should be done only for the purpose of defending true Science,* and not for the purpose of obtaining wealth, honour or fame.

Thus ends the *Bhāṣya* on the II Daily Lesson of *Discourse IV*.

* The motive prompting the man should be—If this ill-mannered person is allowed to go undefeated, then ordinary men will accept his conclusions as the right ones, and this would bring about a total confusion relating to Dharma and true Philosophy,—says the *Tātiparyā*.

ADHYĀYA V
DAILY LESSON I
SECTION (1)
(Sūtras 1—3)

*The Futile Rejoinders consisting in the Unfair Urging of the Fallacy of 'Neutralisation'**

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Futile Rejoinder having been defined (in Sū 1-2-18) as 'that objection which is taken on the basis of mere similarity and dissimilarity', it was described briefly under Sū 1-2-20, where it was pointed out that 'there is multiplicity of Futile Rejoinders owing to there being several and diverse varieties of it', this Futile Rejoinder is now described in detail. The Futile Rejoinders herein described consist of arguments urged in confutation of the argument that has been put forward in demonstration of a certain conclusion, and their number is twenty four, they are as follows —

* Among commentators there has been a great deal of discussion in regard to the exact character of this Fifth Discourse and its connection with what has gone before. To the end of Adh IV we had the *Examination* 'Parīkṣā' of what had been mentioned in Sū 1-1-1 and defined in the rest of Adh I, so that the natural subject matter of Adh V should consist in the continuation of the same *Examination* of things what we find, however in this *Adhyāya* are definitions of the several varieties of Futile Rejoinders and Clinchers. Hence the difficulty.

The *Tātparyā* says—The proper place for the defining of the particular kinds of *Futile Rejoinders* and *Clinchers* was just after the general definition of these in Adh I, yet the author of the Sūtra intentionally omitted to do it there in order not to delay the examination of the objects of cognition, for which the pupils were growing eager, and having finished all that he now naturally reverts to the defining of the several varieties of the two categories that he had left undefined. Further the last part of the preceding *Adhyāya* having dealt with 'Disputation and Wrangling', it is in connection with those that the Sage deals with Futile Rejoinder and Clincher which can occur only in Disputation and Wrangling so that the sequence of Adh V is all right, its subject matter arising directly out of what has gone towards the end of the preceding *Adhyāya*.

The *Parīśuddhi* enters into a long discussion as to whether Adh V is meant to be 'Definition' or 'Examination', and comes to the conclusion that its subject matter consists of *Definition*.

Sūtra 1

(1) Parity,* per Similarity, (2) per Dissimilarity, (3) per Augmentation, (4) per Subtraction, (5) per Uncertainty, (6) per Certainty, (7) per Shuffling, (8) per Probandum, (9) per Convergence, (10) per Non-convergence, (11) per Continued Question, (12) per Counter-Instance, (13) per Non-generation, (14) per Doubt, (15) per Vacillation, (16) per Non-probateness, (17) per Presumption, (18) per Non-difference, (19) per Evidence, (20) per Apprehension, (21) per Non apprehension, (22) per Non-eternality, (23) per Eternality and (24) per Character of Effect.*—

BHĀṢYA

When the argument urged in confutation is through *similarity*, and does not differ in validity from the argument put forward in demonstration, it constitutes 'Parity per Similarity', the said 'non-difference' we shall exemplify in the particular instances that we shall cite 'Parity per Dissimilarity' and the other Futile Rejoinders may be similarly described

BHĀṢYA

The definition (of these Futile Rejoinders) is as follows —

Sūtra 2

(1) and (2)—The original Proposition having been propounded on the basis of similarity and dissimilarity, if the Opponent seeks to prove the contrary of its predicate, also on

* Udayanācārya in his *Bodhasiddhi* (*Nyāyaparaśista*) thus explains the signification of the term 'sama' occurring at the end of these names —(1) According to the *Pārtika*, it means 'equalising', i.e., the Futile Rejoinder is put forward for the purpose of counter-posing or neutralising the effect of the original Reasoning. —(2) according to the *Bhāṣya*, it means that the Futile Rejoinder is put up with a view to show that there is nothing in the original reasoning which differentiates it from what is now put forward; [there is not much difference between these two] —(3) others explain it as meaning that the Futile Rejoinder puts the original reasoner on exactly the same footing as his Opponent putting forward the Rejoinder. —(4) the 'Equality' of the Futile Rejoinder lies in the fact that while demolishing the reasoning of the first party, it demolishes itself also. [Udayanācārya himself accepts this last explanation.]

the basis of similarity and dissimilarity, we have instances of 'Parity per Similarity', and 'Parity per Dissimilarity'*

BHĀṢYA

(1) When the original proposition is propounded on the basis of similarity, if the Opposition to it, seeking to establish the contrary of its predicate, is set up also on the basis of similarity,—and this Opposition does not differ from the argument put forward in support of the original proposition,—it is a case of that Opposition which is called 'Parity per Similarity' Eg The Proposition having been in the form 'The Soul must be *active* (mobile)—because every Substance is endowed with qualities conducive to *activity*,—the clod of earth, which is a substance, is endowed with qualities conducive to *activity* and is found to be *active*,—the Soul also is so—therefore the Soul must be *active*,'—the Opponent sets up the following opposition to it, also on the basis of Similarity —'The Soul must be *inactive*,—because every all pervading substance is *inactive*,—*Ākāśa* which is an all pervading substance is *inactive*,—the Soul also is so,—therefore the Soul must be *inactive*.' And there is no special reason why on the ground of its *similarity* to active substances the Soul should be regarded as *active*, and it should not be regarded as *inactive* on the ground of its *similarity* to *inactive* substances —so that inasmuch as there is no special reason (which makes one or the other more valid) this is an instance of Futile Rejoinder called 'Parity per Similarity' [This is a case where the original Proposition is based upon Similarity, and the Opposition to it is also based upon Similarity]

(2) An instance of 'Parity per Dissimilarity' (in opposition to the same Proposition) is the following—'The clod of earth which is endowed with qualities conducive to activity, is found to be limited in its extent,—the Soul is not so limited—therefore the Soul cannot be active, like the clod of Earth,—there being no special reason why, on the basis of its *similarity* to an *active* substance, the Soul should be regarded as *active*—and why on the basis of its *dissimilarity* to the *active* substance, it should not be

* *Sādharmyavādharmavādhyām* is to be construed with *apainmhārē* as also with *taddharmatāparyoṣopapāttih*—according to the interpretation of the *Bhāṣya* Viśvanātha appears to construe it only with the latter term

regarded as *inactive*, and inasmuch as there is no such special reason, it is a case of 'Parity per Dissimilarity'. [This is a case of the Proposition being based on Similarity, and the Opposition on Dissimilarity]

(3) The original Proposition being set up on the basis of *dissimilarity*,—'The Soul must be inactive,—because it is all-pervading,—every *active* substance is found to be not all-pervading, as in the case of the clod of Earth,—the Soul is not so non all-pervading—hence it must be inactive'—the following opposition is set up on the basis of *dissimilarity*—'the Ālāśa, which is an inactive substance, is found to be devoid of qualities conducive to activity,—the Soul is not so devoid of such qualities,—hence the Soul cannot be inactive',—and there is no special reason why, on the ground of its *dissimilarity* to the *active* substance the Soul should be regarded as *inactive* and why, on the ground of its *dissimilarity* to the *inactive* substance, it should not be regarded as *active*, thus there being no such special reason, this is an instance of 'Parity per Dissimilarity'. [This is an instance of the Proposition as well as its Opposition both being based upon Dissimilarity]

(4) An instance of 'Parity per Similarity' (in opposition to the same Proposition)*—'the clod of Earth which is *active*, is found to be endowed with qualities conducive to activity,—the Soul also is so endowed,—hence it should be *active*',—there is no special reason why, on the ground of its *dissimilarity* to the *active* substance, the Soul should be regarded as *inactive*, and why on the ground of its *similarity* to the *active* substance it should not be regarded as *active*, and there being no such special reason, this is an instance of 'Parity per Similarity'. [This is an instance of the Proposition being based upon *Dissimilarity* and the Opposition on *Similarity*]

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

The answer to the above two Futile Rejoinders is as follows —†

* The words अपरिचयम्पुनः wanting in the *Vat* text is supplied by the *Puri* Ms B and also *Mss* C and D

† *Udayanacharya* in his *Bodha-siddhi* says—Each of these two Futile Rejoinders is three-fold : (1) bearing upon a true subject (2) bearing upon an untrue subject and (3) consisting of wrong expression. The examples

Sūtra 3

The proposition would be established in the same manner as the fact of a certain animal being the 'Cow' is established by the presence in it of the class character of the 'cow'.—

BHĀṢYA

If one were to seek to establish his proposition by means of mere 'similarity', or by means of mere 'dissimilarity',—then there would certainly be the uncertainty (inconclusiveness, urged in the Futile Rejoinder) There is however no such uncertainty when the conclusion is based upon a particular property [such as is invariably concomitant with what is sought to be proved]; e.g. that a certain animal is the cow is proved by reason only of that 'similarity of it to the cow' which consists in *the presence of the particular class character 'cow'* (which is invariably concomitant with, inseparable from, all cows),—and not by reason of the presence of such other properties as are different from the *presence of the dewlap* * [which *other properties* are not invariably concomitant with all cows] Similarly the proposition that a certain animal is the cow is proved by reason only of that 'dissimilarity of it to the Horse' which consists in *the presence of the lass-character 'cow'*—and not that dissimilarity which might consist in a mere diversity of qualities etc All this has been explained in the section on 'Factors of Reasoning' (in *Bhāṣya* on Sū 1-1-39), where it has been pointed out that in the sentence

cited in the Vartika belong to the first kind (Sound being really non-eternal) Following is the example of the second kind —The Proposition being propounded in the form 'Sound must be *eternal*, because it is intangible, like Ākāśa', the Opposition is set up against it that 'Sound being cognisable and as such similar to *non eternal* things, it should be regarded as *non-eternal*' * The examples cited in the *Bhāṣya* belong to the third kind, as the subject thereof is true, it is only the verbal expression that is defective' A Rejoinder, even though quite right in matter, if it is put up in wrong form, becomes Futile

* The word '*sasnadistambandhat*' as it stands, would mean that the said conclusion cannot be proved by *the presence of the dewlap etc* This however would be wrong, as *the presence of the dewlap etc*, is as peculiar to, and invariably concomitant with, all cows, as the class-character 'cow' itself In view of this the *Tatparyā* has explained the compound '*sasnadis*' as meaning properties *other than the presence of the dewlap*

(formulating the inferential argument), several Instruments of Cognition combine together and conjointly accomplish the common purpose (of proving the conclusion),—and that the *uncertainty* (that the Futile Rejoinders point out) can apply only to Fallacious Reasonings (and not to valid reasonings)

End of Section (1)

SECTION (2)

(Sūtras 4-6)

Dealing with the six Futile Rejoinders—(3) 'Parity per Augmentation', (4) 'Parity per Subtraction' (5) Parity per Uncertainty', (6) 'Parity per Certainty', (7) 'Parity per Shuffling', and (8) 'Parity per Probandum',—which are based upon the diversity of the character of the Subject and that of the Example

Sūtra 4

Based upon the difference in the properties of the 'Subject' * and of the 'Example' are the Futile Rejoinders named (3) 'Parity per Augmentation' (4) Parity per Subtraction', (5) 'Parity per Uncertainty' (6) 'Parity per Certainty', (7) 'Parity per Shuffling' and based upon the fact of both (Subject and Example) being 'objects to be proved' (by Inference) is the Futile Rejoinder named (8) 'Parity per Probandum'—

BHĀṢYA

(3) When the Opposer puts forward the contingency of an additional property of the 'Example' subsisting in the 'Subject', it is 'Parity per Augmentation' † E.g. [against the Proposition that 'the Soul must be active because it is endowed with properties conducive to action, like the Clod of Earth'] the Opposition is set up—"if by reason of the presence of qualities conducive to action, the Soul should, like the Clod of Earth, be regarded as active, then, like the Clod of Earth, it has to be

* 'Sādhyā' says Viśvanātha stands here for *prāya*, 'subject'. The diverse character referred to are *existence* and *non-existence*.

† The property in question does not really belong to the 'Subject', and the Rejoinder attributes that property to it, thus there is an accession to, a union of the properties of, the 'Subject'. Hence the name 'Parity per Augmentation'.

regarded as tangible also; if it is not tangible, like the Clod of Earth, then it should not be active either; or you should point out some special reason (why it should be regarded as *active*, and not as *tangible*). [Here the *additional* quality of *tangibility*, which is not existent in the Soul, is attributed to it]."⁶

(4) When the Opposer urges the contingency of the *absence of a certain property* in the Subject, on the analogy of the 'Example',—It is 'Parity per subtraction'; e. g., (against the same Proposition) the Opposition is set up—"inasmuch as the Clod of Earth is found to be *active* and *not all-pervading*, the Soul also, if active, should be regarded as *not all-pervading*; or you should point out some special reason (why it should be regarded as *active* and not as *not all-pervading*) [Here the property of *all-pervadingness* is subtracted from the Soul] †

(5) and (6) 'Varnya' means 'khyāpaniya', 'that which is yet to be known', hence 'uncertain', and 'avarnya', 'certain', is the reverse of that; these two properties, 'uncertainty' and 'certainty' belong respectively to the 'Subject' and the 'Example' [the presence of the Probandum in the Example being known for *certain*, while its presence in the Subject is still *uncertain*]; and when, in opposition, the opposer reverses these qualities (by attributing *uncertainty* to the 'Example', and *certainty* to the 'Subject'), we have the Futile Rejoinders, 'Parity per Uncertainty' and 'Parity per Certainty' §

* This Futile Rejoinder is intended to urge the Fallacy of 'Contradiction'—says Udayana.

† This is intended to urge the Fallacy of the 'Unknown'.

§ 'Parity per Uncertainty', by reducing the Example to Uncertainty, makes it equal to the 'Subject', and 'Parity per Certainty', by removing *uncertainty* from the 'Subject', makes it equal to the 'Example'. The 'Subject' is that in which the presence of the Probandum is *doubtful* and is sought to be confirmed by the argument in question, while the 'Example' is that wherein the presence of the Probandum is known for certain.

As an example of 'Parity per Uncertainty' in the generalised form, Viśvanātha puts forward the following—Against any argument that the First Party might put up in support of his Proposition, the Opponent will set up the following Opposition—"What can prove the Proposition is only that Property which as Probans, subsists in the Subject of that Proposition;—this Probans must in order to be effective, subsist in the Example also;—now the principal property that subsists in the 'Subject' is the character of

(7) 'The 'Example' being endowed with the property that constitutes the Probans (proving the desired Proposition),—if the Opponent attributes to it some other property, and then urges the fact of this other property being such as is not invariably concomitant with the properties of the Probandum—it is a case of 'Parity per Shuffling'. E.g. (against the same Proposition) we have the Opposition—"One thing endowed with qualities conducive to action is found to be *possessed of Gravity*, as we find in the Clod of Earth (Example),—while another thing similarly endowed is found to be *devoid of Gravity*, as we find in the case of Air,—similarly it is possible that while one thing, the Clod of Earth, which is endowed with qualities conducive to action, is *active*, another thing, the Soul, which is similarly endowed, may be *without action*—or you should show some special reason (against this) *

(8) That character is called 'Probandum' which is found to be one upon which the whole force of the Probans and the other Factors of the Reasoning is operative and when such

having the presence of the probandum doubtful—and this same character should reside in the Example—hence the Example also should be one in which *the presence of the probandum is doubtful*—And the following is the example of 'Parity per Certainty'—The Example must be one in which the presence of the Probandum is known for certain—the property in the Example must also reside in the Subject—hence the Subject also must be one in which the presence of the Probandum is known for certain—and if the Subject is so, then it loses the very character of the Subject, which must be one in which the presence of the Probandum is only *doubtful*!

The 'Parity per Uncertainty' is intended to urge the Fallacy of contradiction' and 'Parity per Certainty' is intended to urge the Fallacy of the 'unknown',—says Udayana

* Here the Opponent attributes to the Example Clod of Earth the quality of 'gravity', and then shows that *gravity* one quality of the Example, is not invariably concomitant with the *qualities conducive to action* (as in Air, we find these latter, but not the former)—and analogously it may be possible that *qualities conducive to action* which also belong to the Example, may not be invariably concomitant with *activity*. Here we have a case of a property (gravity) being found in the Example which is not invariably concomitant with the Probans 'qualities conducive to action'. This also includes the case where the property found in the Example is one with which the Probans is not invariably concomitant. This Futile Rejoinder is intended to urge the Fallacy of Inconclusiveness—says Udayana

character is attributed to the 'Example', it is 'Parity *per Probandum*' E g., "If the Soul is to be regarded as *active*, in the same manner as the Clod of Earth is active, then it comes to this that the Clod of Earth is like the Soul—and the Soul is the Subject in regard to which the presence of Activity is still to be proved,—hence the Clod of Earth also should be one in regard to which the presence of Activity is still to be proved —if this is not so, then it is not* true that the Soul is like the Clod of Earth [which means that the Example cited is not right]"†

The answer to the above six Futile Rejoinders is as follows —

Sutra 5

Inasmuch as the 'Reaffirmation' (leading to the conclusion) is only secured on the basis of a particular similarity (between the 'Subject' and the 'Example'), there can be no denial of it on the basis of any mere dissimilarity §

It is not possible to *hide away (i.e. deny)* what has been duly established,—and the 'analogy' (between the Subject and the Example) is duly established, if there is some point of similarity between them, as we find in the case of the well-known analogy 'as the Cow so the Gavaya'—this being so, in regard to the cow and the *Gavaya*, it is not possible to urge that "there is some difference (of character) between the two (and hence the analogy is not right)" —similarly (in the case in question) when on the point of that character which is meant to establish the conclusion, it is found that it is present in the

* This ²⁷ is wanting in the *Viz* text, it is found in the *Purī* Ma also in C and D

† The Subject the Proband and the Example must be such as are definitely known from other sources of knowledge and are not dependent upon the reasoning of which they themselves form parts. That which is to be proved, i.e. the Probandum, is one that is not so known. If the Example is shown to be one which also is still to be proved, this vitiates the entire reasoning

This is meant to urge the Fallacy of the 'Unknown'

§ Invariable concomitance is the essential element and when we have even one point of similarity which is invariably concomitant with the Probandum, that is enough to prove our conclusion. It is not possible for the 'Subject' and the 'Example' to have no dissimilarity at all; that would mean *identity*. All that is necessary is that they should resemble on certain such points as are invariably concomitant with the Probandum.

Example (and in the Subject),—it cannot be possible to deny the conclusiveness of the said character merely by pointing out that there is some difference between the two, consisting in a diversity in their properties.

Sūtra 6.

Further, inasmuch as the 'Example' becomes an 'Example' only by reason of the indication of the actual presence, in it, of the Probandum [it can never be said to stand on the same footing as the Probandum, which is still to be proved].

BHĀṢYA

What is indicated (in the Example) is only such a fact as is not incompatible with what is agreed upon by all men, ordinary as well as learned, and since it is only when the presence of the Probandum is so indicated that the Example becomes a true 'Example',—there can be no ground for saying that the Example stands on the same footing as the Probandum*.

End of Section (2)

SECTION (3)

[*Sūtras 7-8*]

Dealing with (9) 'Parity per Convergence' and (10) 'Parity per Non-convergence.'

Sūtra 7

"The Probans (could establish the Probandum) either by becoming united, or not becoming united, with the Probandum,—if it becomes united with it, then it becomes non-different from it, while if it does not become united with it, it cannot prove it"—these arguments constitute (9) 'Parity per Convergence' and (10) 'Parity per non-convergence'.

BHĀṢYA

"Is it by becoming united with the Probandum that the Probans would establish it? Or by not becoming united with it? It cannot establish it by becoming united with it, because by

* The answer given in Su. 5, applies to all the six Futile Rejoinders described in Su. 4. What is said in Su. 6, is the answer that is applicable to only three of them—'Parity per Uncertainty', 'Parity per Certainty', and 'Parity per Probandum'—*Tatparya*.

becoming united with it, it would become non different from it, and as such could not establish it. When of two things both are existent, and become united,—which could be the 'probans', the 'establisher', and which the 'probandum' * the 'established'? If, on the other hand, the Probans does not become united with the Probandum,—then (on that very account) it could not establish it, for example, the Lamp does not illumine an object unless it is united with it. When the Opposition is urged on the basis of 'uniting' (Converging), it is 'Parity per Convergence', and when it is urged on the basis of 'not-uniting' (non-converging), it is 'Parity per Non-convergence'.

The answer to the above two Futile Rejoinders is as follows —

Sūtra 8

The Denials (embodied in the Rejoinders) are not effective, (a) because we find the Jar and such other objects accomplished (when their causes are in contact with them), and (b) because Killing by magic (is accomplished without the killer coming into contact with the killed person) †

BHĀṢYA

The denial is not right, in either of the two forms (a) Such effects as the Jar and the like are brought about by the Agent, the Instruments, and the Receptacle, only when these are in contact with the Clay (out of which the Jar is made) [So that 'Parity per Convergence' can have no force] —and (b) when trouble (killing) is brought on a person by means of magical spells, we find that the cause brings about its effect without coming into contact with it [So that 'Parity per Non Convergence' also can have no force]

End of Section (3) †

* It is only what is not already accomplished that can be established what is united with anything must be an accomplished entity hence no such thing can be what is to be established the 'probandum', and when two things unite they become identified, hence if the Probans and the Probandum become united, there can be no relation of cause and effect between them —*Tātparyā*

†The printed *Nyāyaśāstrānibandha* (Bd Ind) reads व्यभिचार for अभिचार.

SECTION (4)

Sūtra 9

Dealing with—(11) 'Parity per Continued Question' and (12) 'Parity per Counter-instance'

Sūtra 9

(a) When the basis of the 'Example' is not mentioned, it is (11) 'Parity per Continued Question' and (b) when the Opposition is set up through a counterinstance, it is (12) 'Parity per Counter instance'

BHĀṢYA

(a) When the Opposition is set up in the form of the 'Continued Questioning'—that "it is necessary (for the propounder of the original Proposition) to point out the proof for the Probans also"—it is Opposition called 'Parity per Continued Question' *Eg*, "You do not mention the reason (basis) for asserting that the Clod of Earth, which is endowed with qualities conducive to action, must be active, and until the reason is mentioned, nothing can be accepted as true" *

(b) When the Opposition is based upon a counter-instance, it is 'Parity per Counter-instance' *Eg* the original proposition having been put forward in the form 'The Soul must be active,—because it is endowed with qualities conducive to action,—like the Clod of Earth',—the Opponent sets up a counter-instance—"Ākāśa, which is endowed with qualities conducive to action, is found to be *without action* [and hence why cannot the Soul be regarded as *inactive*, like Ākāśa?]" But what is that quality in Ākāśa which is conducive to action? "It consists of contact with Air, which aided by Faculty or momentum (leads to action), as is found in the case of the contact of Air with the Tree" †

The answer to the above Futile Rejoinders is as follows —

* The *Tatparya* thus explains the difference between 'Parity per Continued Question' and 'Parity per Probandum'.—In 'Parity per Probandum' the Opponent urges the necessity of the Probans and all other Factors of Reasoning being provided in support of the Example, exactly in the same manner as is done in support of the Probandum, while in 'Parity per Continued Question', he only wants to know by what means of cognition the Example is known.

† Contact of Air with the Tree leads to the action of moving in the Tree, hence the contact of Air in Ākāśa also should be conducive to action.

Sūtra 10

The continued question could come to an end just as it does in the case of the fetching of the Lamp

BHĀṢYA

The first party, on being questioned by the Opponent in the manner described in the preceding Sūtra, can say (in reply)—Who are the persons that fetch the lamp? and why do they fetch it? [The Opponent will say]—"It is fetched by persons desiring to see, and they fetch it for the purpose of seeing the things to be seen." But [the first party will ask again] Why do not people, desiring to see the Lamp (which is a thing to be seen) fetch another lamp?—"They do not do so, because they can see the lamp even without the second lamp." From this, it follows that for the seeing of the Lamp itself, the fetching of another lamp is useless. [Now turning to the case in question]—For what purpose is the Example put forward?—It is put forward for the purpose of making known something not already known. Why then is the mention of the basis of the Example sought for* (by the Opponent setting up the Futile Rejoinder)? If it is sought for the purpose of making the Example known,—then our contention is that the Example is already known [as, if it were not known, it would not be put forward as Example], for the Example is that in regard to which there is a consensus of opinion among all men, learned and unlearned, so that any mention of basis for the purpose of making the Example known would be absolutely useless. This is the answer to 'Parity per Continued Question'.

The answer to 'Parity per Counter-instance' is as follows:—

Sūtra 11

If the Counter-instance is an effective reason, the Example also cannot but be an effective reason.

BHĀṢYA

When the Opponent puts forward the Counter-instance, he does not cite any special reason in support thereof—to show that for such and such a reason the Counter-instance is an

* The correct reading is देश्यते as found in Mss B C. and D.

effective reason, and the Example is not so. So that, when the Counter-instance is recognised as an effective reason, there can be no ground for saying that the Example is not an effective reason ;--and when can it not fail to be effective reason ? Only when it is itself not capable of being denied and is capable of proving the conclusion [So that if it is effective reason, it must prove the conclusion]

End of Section (4)

SECTION (5)

(Sūtras 12-13)

Dealing with (13) ' Parity per Non generation '

Sūtra 12

' Before the birth (of the Subject), since [what is urged as] the ground [for the probandum being predicated of it] cannot subsist, [the argument can prove nothing], "--this is ' Parity per Non-generation '

BHĀṢYA

The proposition being stated in the form--' Sound must be non eternal because it comes after effort, like the Jar ', the Opponent sets up the following Opposition --" Before it is produced, the Sound has not appeared, hence (at that time) the character of coming after effort, which is the ground urged for its non-eternality, does not subsist in Sound, and since this character does not subsist in Sound, it follows that Sound is eternal, and that which is eternal is never produced' --This opposition, based upon ' non generation ' (or non-production), is ' Parity per Non-generation '.

The answer to the above Futile Rejoinder is as follows --

Sūtra 13

Since it is only when it has been produced that the thing is what it is, and since what is urged as the ground (for the Proposition) does then subsist in it,--the presence of the ground cannot be denied.

BHĀṢYA

Since it is only when it has been produced that the thing is what it is--i.e., it is only when it has been produced that the Sound becomes ' Sound ', before it is produced, it is not even

'Sound', and as it is 'Sound' only after it has been produced, and when the Sound has been produced, the character of coming after effort, which is the ground for non-eternality, is actually present in it, and since the ground does then subsist in it, there is no force in the objection that 'before the birth of the Subject, the ground does not subsist in it' (urged in the Futile Rejoinder)

End of Section (5)

SECTION (6)

[Sūtras 14-15]

Dealing with 'Parity per Doubt'

Sūtra 14

The 'Community' and the 'Example', both being equally perceptible by the senses, [the Opposition] based upon similarity to 'eternal' as well as 'non-eternal' things constitutes 'Parity per Doubt'

BHĀṢYA

The Proposition being put forward in the form—'Sound must be non eternal, because it comes after effort, like the Jar',—the Opponent opposes it by casting doubt over it "Even though Sound comes after effort, it has this similarity to the eternal 'Community' that both are perceptible by the senses,—and the same also constitutes its similarity to the non-eternal 'Jar'—thus, by reason of its similarity to both 'eternal' and 'non-eternal' things, there must be doubt (as to the real character of Sound) "

The answer to the above is as follows

Sūtra 15

(a) As regards the doubt being raised on the basis of (mere) 'similarity', [our answer is that] there can be no such doubt when the 'dissimilarity' (to that same thing) has been duly recognised, (b) if, even on both (similarity and dissimilarity) being recognised doubts were to arise, then there would be no end to such doubts,—(c) and since mere 'similarity' is not accepted as an everlasting source of doubt,—the opposition set up cannot be right

BHĀṢYA

(a) When, on perceiving the distinguishing feature of 'Man'—which constitutes its 'dissimilarity' (to the Pillar)—it has been duly ascertained that the object perceived is a 'Man',—there is no room for any doubt arising in regard to it on the basis of some 'similarity' between Man and Pillar. Thus, in the case of Sound, the character of coming after effort, which forms its distinguishing feature and dissimilarity to eternal things, having been recognised, its 'non-eternality' becomes duly ascertained, and there can be no room for any further doubt arising on the mere ground of its similarity to eternal and non-eternal things. (b) If such a Doubt were to arise, then, inasmuch as the 'similarity' between the Man and the Pillar would never cease, the Doubt would never come to an end. (c) Lastly, we do not admit that 'similarity' is an everlasting source of Doubt, even when the distinctive feature of the thing has been duly recognised, e.g., when the distinctive feature of Man has been recognised, a mere similarity between 'Man' and 'Pillar' does not become a source of doubt.

End of Section (6)

SECTION (7)

[Sūtras 16-17]

Dealing with 'Parity per Neutralisation'

Sūtra 16

'By reason of Similarity to both, there arises vacillation'—(Opposition) based upon this reasoning is Parity per Neutralisation'

BHĀṢYA

By reason of the similarity (of Sound) to both, eternal and non-eternal things, there is likelihood of the two contrary views [i.e. the original Proposition as well as its contrary]—this is what is meant by the term '*prakriyā*', or 'vacillation' in the Sūtra. One view being—'Sound must be non-eternal, because it comes after effort, like the Jar',—the other view is propounded on the basis of the similarity (of Sound) to Eternal things ['Sound must be eternal, because it is perceptible by the Auditory Organ, like the class-character Sound']. Thus then, it is found that when the Probans—'because it comes after effort'—is put for-

ward as constituting the similarity (of Sound) to *non-eternal* things, it is not free from the possibility of the contrary view being set up, and in the face of this possibility, the conclusion sought to be based upon that Probans cannot be established. The same holds good in regard to a Probans that would be put forward as constituting the 'similarity' (of Sound) to *eternal* things. The Opposition put forward on the basis of this 'vacillation' constitutes 'Parity per Neutralisation'.

What has been said in this Sutra applies also to the case of *Dissimilarity*, and "by reason of Dissimilarity to both, there arises Vacillation,—and Opposition based upon this reasoning constitutes *Parity per Neutralisation*'.

The answer to the above is as follows —

Sutra 17

Inasmuch as the said 'Vacillation' can follow only from the counter view, there can be no denial of it specially as that contrary view must be regarded as established (before the 'Vacillation' can be put forward) *

BHĀṢYA

When the Opponent says that—"by reason of similarity to both there arises vacillation"—his assertion comes to this that there is 'vacillation', because the *counter view* is there, it is only when there is (real) similarity to both that one of them can be called the 'counter view', hence it follows from the statement that the 'counter view' is an established fact, and the 'counter view' being regarded as established, its denial cannot be right. If the 'counter view' is *established*, its denial cannot be right and if its denial is right, the 'counter view' can not be regarded as *established*, for 'the establishment of the counter view' and 'the right denial of the counter view' are contradictory terms.

When however [as in the case of the Fallacy of Neutralisation, which also is based upon vacillation] the 'vacillation' is due to the absence of definite knowledge (in regard to the subject

* The term *pratīpakṣa* 'counter view' stands for the view of the First Party, it is called 'counter view' from the Opponent's point of view—*Udayana* and *Viśvanatha*.

in question) [and not to the mere existence of the counter-view], the 'vacillation' comes to an end, as soon as that definite right knowledge is attained; i.e., as soon as definite right knowledge has been attained, the vacillation ceases*.

End of Section (7)

SECTION (8)

[Sūtras 18 20]

Dealing with (16) 'Parity per Non-probative-ness'

Sūtra 18

'Parity per Non-probative-ness' is based upon the contention that "the Probans as such cannot exist at any of the three points of time"

BHĀṢYA

"'Probans' is that which proves and this could exist only either (a) before, or (b) after or (c) together with, the probandum (that which it is intended to prove). Now, (a) if the Probans is held to exist before the Probandum,—at the time that the Probandum is not there, of what could it be the 'probans', 'means of proving'? (b) If it is held to exist after the Probandum,—in the absence of the Probans, of what could there be the 'Probandum' (to be proved)? (c) If the Probans and the Probandum are held to exist (simultaneously),—since both would be equally existent, which could be the 'probans' (means of proving) of what? From all this it follows that the 'probans' does not differ from what is non probative"

* When the Opponent puts up the Futile Rejoinder based upon the vacillation in regard to the exact character of Sound on account of its being similar to eternal as well as non-eternal things,—he admits that the proposition that 'sound is non eternal' is as admissible as that 'Sound is eternal', that both possess an equal degree of truth, otherwise, if one were more reasonable that would be definitely accepted and there would be no vacillation. And when he accepts the admissibility of the view that 'Sound is non eternal', he cannot, consistently with himself, deny it.

The position of the person urging the Fallacy of 'Neutralisation' is different, he bases his denial of the conclusion of the first party, not upon any vacillation, but upon absence of true knowledge.

This contention, thus based upon similarity to what is non-probative, constitutes 'Parity per Non probativeness' *

The answer to the above Futile Rejoinder is as follows —

Sūtra 19

It is not true that "the Probans cannot exist at any of the three points of time", because it is by the Probans that the Probandum can be proved

BHĀṢYA

It is not true that "the Probans cannot exist at any of the three points of time",—why?—because it is by the Probans that the Probandum is proved As a matter of fact, we find that the accomplishing of what is to be accomplished, as also the knowing of what is to be known, is brought about by a cause and this patent fact of ordinary perception is an instance in point † As regards the question—'at the time that the Probandum is non-existent of what could the Probans be the means of proving?'—our answer is that [it is the means of proving of what is to be proved, just as in the cases cited] the cause is the means of accomplishing what is to be accomplished and of the knowing of what is to be made known

Sūtra 20

Further, [according to the Opponent's reasoning] there can be no Denial, from which it follows that what has been denied cannot be denied

* This Futile Rejoinder differs from 'Parity per Convergence' and 'Parity per Non convergence' on the following points —(1) In these latter the question raised was in regard to the form of the Probans while in the present case it is raised in regard to its causal efficiency (2) in the latter two the convergence or otherwise was in regard to the thing denoted by the words of the probans while here it is the verbal expression that is taken up for enquiry, (3) there were only two alternatives while here we have three, (4) those two had the semblance of the contention urging the fact of the qualification of the Probans being untrue while here the content on urges a reasoning to the contrary—*Bodhisiddhi* (Udayana)

† Just as the accomplishing of what is to be accomplished is brought about by a cause, in the same manner the proving of what is to be proved (i.e. the Probandum) must be brought about by a cause, and this cause is the Probans

BHĀṢYA

[Exactly what you have urged against our Probans, we can urge, with equal force, against the Opponent]—The denial cannot exist, either before, or after, or together with, what is denied—and since there can be no 'Denial' at all (of the Probans urged by the first party), it follows that the Probans (being undeniable) is firmly established

End of Section (8)

SECTION (9)

[Sūtras 21-22]

Dealing with (17) 'Parity per Presumption'

Sūtra 21

When the contrary conclusion is proved by means of Presumption, it is 'Parity per Presumption'

BHĀṢYA

'The proposition having been sought to be established by the reasoning 'Sound is non-eternal, because it comes after effort, like the Jar',—if the Opponent seeks to establish the contrary conclusion by means of Presumption,—this is a case of 'Parity per Presumption', it is as follows—'If Sound is held to be non-eternal, on the ground of its coming after effort, which constitutes its similarity to non-eternal things,—then it follows by implication, that Sound must be regarded as eternal, on the ground of its *similarity to eternal things*, consisting in the fact that it is *intangible*, like eternal things'

The answer to the above Futile Rejoinder is as follows—

Sūtra 22

(A) If what is not expressly stated can be taken as following by implication, then the renouncing would be taken as following by implication, for the simple reason that such renouncing is not expressly stated,—(B) and further, 'Presumption' would be indecisive.

BHĀṢYA

(A) Without showing the capacity (of the words to afford the idea of what is presumed), if what is not expressly stated is held (by the Opponent) to be taken as implied,—then the renoun-

cing by such an arguer of his own view may also be taken as implied, for the simple reason that it is not expressly stated, and thus inasmuch as the view that 'Sound is non-eternal' would be regarded as established (by reason of its being taken as implied by reason of its not being expressly stated by you), this would mean that your own view that 'Sound is eternal' has been renounced.

(B) *Further, Presumption would be indecisive*, that is, Presumption would apply equally to both views, for 'if on the ground of its similarity to eternal things consisting of *intangibility*, Sound were to be regarded as *eternal*, like *Ākāśa*,—it would be taken as following by implication that, on account of its similarity to *non-eternal* things, consisting in *its coming after effort*, Sound is *non-eternal*' *

Then again, conclusive Presumption does not necessarily follow from mere negation, for instance, because the *solid* gravel falls, it does not necessarily follow by presumption that there can be no falling of Water, which is liquid (not solid)

End of Section (9)

SECTION (10)

[Sutra 23—24]

Dealing with (1) 'Parity per Non-difference'

Sutra 23

"If the presence of a single (common) property were to make the two things non-different,—then all things would have to be regarded as non-different, because the property of 'existence' is present in all"—this contention constitute 'Parity per Non difference'

BHĀṢYA

The single (common) property, in the case in question, is that of *coming after effort* and because this single property is present in Sound and in the Jar, if these two things be regarded as non-different,—i.e., both be regarded as 'non-eternal',—then all things should have to be regarded as non-different—Why?—Because the property of 'existence' is present in all, the one

* This is the reverse of the argument put forward in the Futile Rejoinder

property of 'existence' is present in all things; and since 'Existence' is present in all things, all things should be regarded as non-different. Such contention constitutes 'Parity per Non-difference'.*

The answer to the above Futile Rejoinder is as follows:—

Sūtra 24

The above denial does not hold, because in the case of some (common property) the presence of certain other properties of the similar thing is possible, while in the case of others such presence is not possible.

BHĀṢYA

For instance, in the case where the one common property between the 'Subject' and the 'Example' consists of 'coming after effort', the presence of another property—which constitutes a further 'non-difference' or 'similarity' between them—is found possible; while in the case of the common property among *all things* consisting of 'existence', the presence of no other common property is found possible, which could constitute a further 'non-difference' among them.

The following might be urged (by the Nihilist, who holds that 'existence' is invariably concomitant with 'Non-eternality');—"Non-eternality would be the other property common to 'all things', the presence whereof would be indicated by the presence (in them) of the property of existence."

(A) Under this assumption, the Proposition would come to be of the following form: 'All entities are non-eternal, because they have the property of Existence' and in that case, no 'Example' would be available, apart from what is already included in the Proposition (which includes 'all things'); and there can be no valid reasoning without an Example, nor would

* Udayana in his *Bodhisiddhi*, notices a different interpretation of this Sūtra by which the meaning is as follows:—"The single property that constitutes the Probans is really effective; so that if the Subject and the Example were taken as possessed of the unqualified probandum, then they could be non-different in every way, *Sarvadeśajah* because their co-existence is well known."

it be right to put up as 'Example' some thing that is already included under the Proposition, for what is itself yet to be proved cannot serve as an 'Example' (B) Then again, inas much as *existent* things are actually found to be both *eternal* and *non-eternal*, they cannot all be regarded as *non-eternal* (on the ground of *existence*) From all this it follows that the sentence—'all things would have to be regarded as non different, because the property of 'existence' is present in all" (Su 23) is meaningless

(C) Lastly, when the Opponent alleges, that "because *existence* is present in all things, they should be regarded as non *eternal*",—he admits that 'Sound is non-eternal', so that opposition to this last Proposition is not quite consistent *

End of Section (10)

SECTION (11)

[Sutras 25 26]

Dealing with (19) 'Parity per Evidence'

Sūtra 25

'Parity per Evidence' is based upon the presence of grounds for both (views)

BHĀṢYA

'If Sound is held to be non eternal because there is present ground (or evidence) for its non eternality—there is present evidence for eternality also, in the shape of *Intangibility*, so that it may be regarded as eternal also" This being an opposition based upon the presence of grounds for both, 'Eternality' and 'Non eternality, is 'Parity per Evidence'

The answer to the above Futile Rejoinder is as follows —

Sūtra 26

This denial has no force, because the presence of ground in support (of the original Proposition) is admitted

BHĀṢYA

When the Opponent alleges 'the presence of grounds for both views' (Su 25), he cannot deny that 'Sound is non eternal because there are grounds for non eternality' If this

* The Futile Rejoinder was urged against the Proposition 'Sound is non-eternal' and yet this is admitted by the Opponent in setting forth the Rejoinder

could be denied, then it would not be true that 'grounds for both views are present' When he speaks of 'the presence of grounds for both views', he admits that there are grounds for 'non-eternality', and having been admitted, it cannot be denied "The denial is due to incongruity" But 'incongruity' applies equally (to both views) "When we pointed out the incongruity consisting of the possibility of both eternality and non eternality, we put forth the denial" But the 'incongruity' applies equally to your own view as well as to that of the other party, and it cannot establish any one of the two views *

End of Section II

SECTION (12)

[Sutra 27-28]

Dealing with 'Parity per Apprehension'

Sutra 27

'Parity per Apprehension' is based upon the fact that what is put forward is found to exist even in the absence of the cause mentioned.

BHĀṢYA

Even in the absence of the character of coming after effort which is mentioned as the cause (ground) of 'non-eternality'—this 'non-eternality' is found in that Sound which proceeds from the breaking of the branches of the tree shaken by the wind [this Sound not being the Product of the Effort of any person],—and the Opposition, based upon this fact of the Probandum being found to exist even in the absence of the Probans, constitutes 'Parity per Apprehension' †

* If you admit the presence of grounds for both views you admit the truth of the other view also, while if you deny the presence of the said grounds, you deny those for your own view also. So that the Futile Rejoinder that you urge justifies itself.—*Udayara*

† The *Bodhisaddha* mentions five kinds of this Futile Rejoinder (1) The Subject existing in the absence of the Probandum which makes it a case of the Fallacy of 'Contradiction',—(2) the Subject existing without the Probans—this being a case of the Fallacy of the 'Unknown',—(3) the Subject existing without both Probans and Probandum,—when there are both of the said fallacies,—(4) the Probandum existing without the Probans—this being a case of untrue premises, the Probans not being invariably concomitant with the Probandum,—(5) the Probans existing without the Probandum, in which case also the necessary invariable concomitance between the two would be wanting. It goes on to cite examples of the Futile Rejoinder based upon each of these five

The answer to the above Futile Rejoinder is as follows —

Sutra 28

Inasmuch as the property in question may be due to some other cause —the denial has no force at all

BHĀṢYA

When the First Party says— [Sound must be non-eternal] *because it is the outcome of effort* ', what is meant is that it is produced from some cause, and it is not meant to restrict the particular product (Sound) to one particular cause only,—so that if the property in question 'Non-eternality', is found in Sound produced from some other cause—in what way does that militate against our view?

End of Section (12)

SECTION (13)

[*Sutras 29-31*]

Dealing with 'Parity per Non-apprehension

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The First Party puts forward the Proposition in the following form]—' It is not true that even before it is uttered, Sound exists and (if it is not heard) it is simply that there is non-apprehension of it ',—this is not true—why?—because we do not perceive any covering or obstruction, that is, in the case of such things as Water (underground) and the like, we find that when they are existent, if there is *non-apprehension* of them, it is due to the presence of obstruction (in the shape of the surface of the ground under which the water lies), in the case of Sound, however, we do not find its non-apprehension to be due to the presence of obstruction or any such causes of non-apprehension, and such cause of its non-apprehension would certainly have been perceived (if it existed), just as it is perceived in the case of Water etc,—as a matter of fact, however, no such cause is perceived (in the case of Sound), hence it follows that when Sound is not apprehended (heard), its condition is contrary (not analogous) to that of the Water etc [i.e. while Water etc., are *existent*, Sound is *non-existent*]' [And against this the Opponent sets up the following Futile Rejoinder]—

Sūtra 29

"Inasmuch as Non-apprehension of the obstruction is also not apprehended,—it follows that this Non-apprehension is not existent; and this proves the contrary conclusion [i.e. existence of the obstruction]—the opposition based upon this contention is 'Parity per Non-apprehension'.

"The 'Non-apprehension' of Obstruction etc., is not apprehended;—and from this 'non-apprehension of the Non-apprehension,' it follows that the latter does not exist; and this 'Non-apprehension' being non-existent, what has been urged by the First Party as the 'Probans' of his reasoning is found to be non-existent, all which leads to the conclusion that Obstruction etc., are *existent*. And since the contrary conclusion is thus proved, the original proposition—'it is not true that even before it is uttered, Sound exists, and it is simply that there is non-apprehension of it'—is *not proved*.

Thus it is found that the probans, 'because Obstruction is not apprehended', is equally applicable to the *Obstruction*, and to the *Non-apprehension of the Obstruction*."

This opposition, based upon Non-apprehension, constitutes 'Parity per Non-apprehension'

The answer to the above Futile Rejoinder is as follows —

Sūtra 30

Since 'Non apprehension' is of the nature of negation of apprehension,* the reason urged is no reason at all

BHĀṢYA

The reasoning—"There can be no non-apprehension of Obstruction, because no such Non-apprehension is apprehended—*is no reasoning at all, because Non-apprehension is of the nature of the negation of apprehension*", that is, because Non apprehension' is nothing more than mere *negation of apprehension*. As a matter of fact, what *exists* forms the object of 'apprehension', and this, by reason of its being apprehended, is asserted to be *existent*; while of 'Non-apprehension' the object is that

* It is of the nature of 'Negation of Apprehension'—i.e. mere 'Negation of Apprehension', without any further qualification—*Bodhendak* (Udayana).

which *does not exist*, and this by reason of its being not apprehended is declared to be *non-existent*. The 'non-apprehension of the non-apprehension of the obstruction' cannot negate the 'non-apprehension', operating as it does upon its own objective, which is 'Non-apprehension', it cannot negate that same 'objective',*—and when the 'non-apprehension of obstruction' is *not negated*, it becomes capable of serving as an effective Probans (for proving the non-existence of the obstruction). 'Obstruction' can be the object of apprehension when it exists and if it exists there should be *apprehension* of it,—so that when it is not apprehended—there being an absence of the 'apprehension' that would indicate the existence of its own objective—from this 'non-apprehension' (serving as the means of cognition) it is understood that the object in question (which would have been apprehended if it existed) is the object of 'Non-apprehension', i.e. it is *non-existent*,† the resultant conclusion being that 'the Obstruction and such other things, which would have been the cause of (which could have accounted for) the non-apprehension of Sound (before its utterance), are *non-existent*'. And the reason for this lies in the fact that what 'Non-apprehension' (as a means of cognition) indicates is that there is no apprehension,—this fact of there being non-apprehension forming the subject of the said 'Non-apprehension'.

* This passage is rather obscure

We have adopted the explanation given by the *Tatparya*—What the Opponent, in putting forward the Futile Rejoinder does, is to urge that there must be obstruction and the apprehension of this obstruction, because we fail to apprehend the non-apprehension of these. But it is far more reasonable to regard the latter absence of apprehension (of the non-apprehension of obstruction) as bearing upon the obstruction and its apprehension, than upon Non-apprehension. Because as the *Nyayamanjari* points out what is negated by a negation must be something *positive*, apprehension proves the *existence*, and 'non-apprehension' the *non-existence*, of only positive entities: hence even the 'non-apprehension', even though of the 'non-apprehension of obstruction', can prove the *non-existence* only of the obstruction and apprehensions, which are positive entities and not of the non-apprehension itself.

The *Bodhisiddhi* also explains similarly

† The *vijaya* object, the cognition of which is brought about by 'Non-apprehension', is the *non-existence* of the object that would have been apprehended

Sūtra 31

Further, because the presence and absence of one's several cognitions are clearly perceptible to every person *

BHĀṢYA

'Therefore the reasoning put forward in the *Futile Rejoinder* is no reasoning at all'—this has to be brought in from the preceding Sūtra. The presence and absence of the several cognitions that living beings have in the body are clearly discernible by them, as is clear from such conceptions as 'My doubtful cognition exists' and 'My doubtful cognition does not exist', similarly in connection with perceptual, inferential verbal and reminiscential cognitions. So that in the case in question, when there is 'non apprehension of the obstruction',—i.e. the non-existence of its apprehension—it is clearly discernible by the person himself, and he has the conception 'My apprehension of the obstruction is not present', or 'Obstruction or any such thing as would be the cause of the non-perception of Sound is not apprehended', from which it follows that what was alleged in (Su. 29)—"inasmuch as the non apprehension of the obstruction is also not apprehended it follows that this Non apprehension also is non-existent"—is not right.

End of Section 13

SECTION 14

Dealing with (22) 'Parity per Non-eternality'

Sūtra 32

'If by reason of 'similarity' two things be regarded as having analogous properties, then all things should have to be regarded as 'non-eternal',—this contention constitutes 'Parity per Non-eternality'

BHĀṢYA

"When the First Party says that—'Sound should be regarded as non-eternal, by reason of its similarity to the Jar, which is non-eternal',—he becomes faced with the undesirable contingency of

*According to *Tatparva* and *Bodhandhā* the Sūtra would mean—'it is clearly perceptible to every person whether a certain cognition apprehends the Existence or Non existence of a thing'. The translation adopts the interpretation of the *Vyayamāṅgari* which is more in keeping with the *Bhāṣya*.

having to regard *all* things as *non-eternal*, by reason of their similarity (consisting of *existence*) to the Jar, which is non-eternal"—This opposition based upon 'non-eternality' constitutes 'Parity per Non eternality' *

The answer to the above Futile Rejoinder is as follows —

Sūtra 33

If rejection can be based upon 'similarity', there should be rejection also of the denial (set up by the Opponent), as there is a similarity between the denial and that which it is sought to deny *

BHĀṢYA

The 'Denial' is that allegation which is fully equipped with the Proposition and the other Factors of Reasoning, and which, while representing the counter view, sets aside the original view,† —and the said 'Denial' has this similarity to the *original view* that both are equipped with the factors of Reasoning, Proposition and the rest. Now, if there is to be a rejection of *non-eternality* (of Sound) on the ground of the 'similarity' (of all things) with the non-eternal (Jar),—then, inasmuch as this would mean that 'similarity' leads to rejection, it would follow that there should be rejection of the *Denial* also, on the ground of its similarity to *what is sought to be denied* (i.e. the original view) §

Sūtra 34

What serves as the Probans is that property which is definitely known to subsist in the Example, as being an infallible indicator of the Probandum, and since such a Probans can be of both kinds, there can be no non-difference (among all things)

* This Futile Rejoinder is described as based upon 'similarity', it includes also a similar rejoinder based upon 'dissimilarity'—says the *Bodhandhī*:

* The right reading of the Sūtra as shown by the *Nyāyasūtrabandha*, the *Bhāṣya* the *Vārtika*, the *Tātparyā* and *Bodhandhī*, is साधर्म्यादिति. प्रतिषेधासिद्धिं प्रतिषेध्यसाधर्म्यात्.

† The correct reading is पक्षनिवर्तकम्; with the reading पक्षनिर्वर्तक, the meaning would be—'which is meant to establish a counter view'.

§ The *Tātparyā* remarks that the answer contained in this Sūtra only puts the Opponent on the same footing as the First Party. The real answer comes in the next Sūtra

BHĀṢYA

That property, which is found in the 'Example' to be an infallible indicator of the Probandum, is what is put forward as the *Probans*. This *Probans* can be of both kinds,—i.e. it may be similar to certain things, and dissimilar to certain other things, when it is similar, it constitutes the 'similarity' (among those things), and when it is dissimilar, it constitutes the 'dissimilarity' (among those things). Now, it is only a particular form of 'similarity' that constitutes the real 'Probans',—and not either mere 'similarity' without any qualification, or mere 'dissimilarity'. What you have urged (under Su 32)—that, "If by reason of similarity two things are to be regarded as having analogous properties, then all things should have to be regarded as non-eternal, and this constitutes Parity per Non-eternality",—is based upon mere 'similarity' and mere 'dissimilarity', and as such cannot be right.*

[In addition to what has been said here] all that was said (in Su 5-1-24) in answer to Parity per Non-difference should be taken as applying with equal force to the present Futile Rejoinder also.

End of Section 14

SECTION (15)

[Sūtras 35-36]

Dealing with (23) 'Parity per Eternality'

Sūtra 35

"The character of 'non-eternality' being eternal, it follows that the 'non-eternal thing' is itself eternal",—based upon this contention is 'Parity per Eternality'.

BHĀṢYA

"The proposition is put forward in the form—'Sound is non-eternal', now, is this 'non-eternality' of Sound eternal, everlasting, or non-eternal, evanescent? If it is present in Sound

*What can rightly prove a conclusion is only such 'similarity' or 'dissimilarity' as is invariably concomitant with the Probandum. While the 'similarity' that has been put forward by the Opponent as his 'probans' in the proving of the 'non-eternality' of all things is 'Existence', and there is no invariable concomitance between 'Existence' and 'Non-eternality' there being several things that are existent and yet eternal, not non-eternal.

at all times, then, since the property (non-eternality) is everlasting, the thing to which that property belongs '(Sound)' must also be everlasting, so that Sound should be *Eternal*. If, on the other hand, the said property ('Non eternality') is not present in Sound at all times,—then since (at some time or other) 'Non-eternality' would be absent in Sound, Sound would be 'eternal'.

This opposition based upon 'Eternality', constitutes 'Parity per Eternality' *

BHĀṢYA

The answer to the above Futile Rejoinder is as follows —

Sūtra 36

Inasmuch as the everlasting character of the 'non-eternality' in the subject of Denial (Sound) [is admitted by the Opponent], the 'non-eternality' of the non eternal thing (Sound) becomes established, so that there can be no basis for the Denial †

When the Opponent speaks of the character of *non-eternality* being 'everlasting' in Sound, which is the object whose non-eternality he seeks to deny,—he admits the *non eternality* of Sound,—and when this 'non-eternality of Sound' has been thus admitted, there is no room for the Denial. If, on the other hand, he does not admit the 'everlasting' character of the 'non eternality in Sound', then for him the expression,— 'because non-eternality in Sound is eternal',—cannot serve as the Probans (of his reasoning),—and in the absence of the Probans, the denial cannot be proved

* In this Sūtra, the mention of non-eternality is meant to include all those specific reasons that may be adduced in support of the non-eternality of Sound. The sense of the definition of 'Parity per Eternality' is as follows—When the Opponent puts forward certain exhaustive alternatives in regard to the property put forward by the First Party, and shows that none of these is admissible, and then proceeds to urge that the Subject cannot, on that account, be accepted as having that property—this form of Opposition constitutes 'Parity per Eternality'—*Bodhandhī* (Udayana)

† The *Nyāyamañjari* reads the Sūtra without अनित्ये and with अनित्यत्वोपपत्ते. The presence or absence of अनित्ये does not make any difference in the meaning. But from the explanation provided in the Bhāṣya, the *Bodhasiddhi* and the *Nyāyamañjari*, अनित्योपपत्ते is the right reading for नित्यत्वोपपत्ते.

In fact, what is meant by Sound being 'non eternal' is that it is *produced and ceases to exist on being destroyed*, and there can be no question against this, hence there is no room for any such question as—"does the non-eternality subsist in Sound at all times or not?"—Why?—Because the non eternality of Sound consists in its being produced and ceasing to exist on being destroyed,—it is not right to regard 'Sound' as the *container* (the receptacle) and 'non eternality' as the *contained*, for such a conception would involve a self contradiction in terms*. Further, 'eternality' and 'non eternality' are contradictory terms (hence also the Denial cannot be maintained), that 'non eternality' and 'eternality'—which are mutual contradictories—should belong to the same Object (Sound) is an impossibility. For these reasons we conclude that what has been alleged by the Opponent—that 'Non eternality being eternal, Sound must be eternal'—has absolutely no sense.

End of Section 15

SECTION (16)

[Sūtras 37-38]

Dealing with (24) 'Parity per character of Effect'

Sutra 37

'Parity per character of Effect' is based on the diverse character of the products of effort

BHĀṢYA

The original proposition is put up in the form—'Sound is non eternal, because it is the outcome of effort', now that which is 'the outcome of effort' is such as, *not having previous existence comes into existence*, as is found to be the case with such products as the Jar and the like, that which is 'non eternal', on the other hand, is such as, *having come into existence, ceases to exist*. Such being the condition of things, the Opposition is

* If 'non-eternality' is contained in 'Sound', then alone can there be any force in the contention that if the former is eternal, the latter also should be so, as in that case alone could the former not subsist without the latter. As a matter of fact the relation of 'container and contained' does not subsist between Sound and Non eternality. For such relationship belongs only to positive entities, and Non-eternality is purely negative, and this only qualifies Sound, it does not subsist in it —says the Nyāyamāñjarī

set up on the basis of *the diverse character of the products of effort* 'Coming into existence after effort' we find in the case of the jar, etc., and we also find the 'manifestation' of things concealed under some obstruction, by the removal of the obstruction [and this also is the *outcome of effort*], and there is no special reason to show whether Sound *comes into existence after Effort*, or there is only *manifestation* of it (after effort) and the Opposition set up on the basis of this fact of both these (production and manifestation) being equally the 'products of effort',* is 'Parity per Character of Effect'

The answer to the above Futile Rejoinder is as follows —

Sutra 38

Even though there are several Kinds of Products —inasmuch as [in the other Kind of Product] causes of non-apprehension are present, Effort could not be the cause (of mere 'manifestation' of Sound in whose case there is no cause of non apprehension)*

Even though there are several kinds of Products there are present causes of non-apprehension —hence Effort could not be the cause of the manifestation of Sound In a case where there is *manifestation* as the *outcome of effort*, it is possible that there may have been some cause, in the shape of obstruction, to which its non apprehension (before manifestation) was due, so that when as a result of effort there is a removal of the obstruction, there comes about the *apprehension* of the thing which constitutes its 'manifestation' In the case of Sound however, no such cause of Non apprehension is possible, by the removal whereof as following from Effort, there could come about the 'manifestation' of

* The mere fact of Sound being the *outcome of Effort* does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that it is non-eternal it comes into existence or is destroyed for even if it were only *manifested* it could be regarded as the outcome of effort

* We have translated the Sutra as it is explained in the Bhāṣya and read in all manuscripts The interpretation however is far fetched hence the Nyāyamangalī has read the Sutra with the last term as अनुपपत्तिविराणा नुपपत्ते and explains it to mean as follows — *Even though there are various kinds of Products —Effort cannot be regarded as the cause (of the manifestation of Sound) as there is not present (in the case of Sound) any cause of its non apprehension* This is much simpler

the Sound consisting of its *apprehension*. From this it follows that Sound is *produced*, not *manifested* (by Effort)*

End of Section 16

SECTION (17)

[Sūtras 39-43]

*Dealing with the 'Satpaks'—the six steps of a Futile Discussion**

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

[The first step consisting of the Proposition, 'Sound must be non eternal, because it is the outcome of effort, like the jar', it is urged against this that the Probans is 'inconclusive', and being 'inconclusive', it cannot prove the 'conclusion'—(this represents the second step),—[to this the First Party, offers the following *wrong answer*, which represents the third step]—If my Probans cannot prove the conclusion because it is inconclusive, then—

Sūtras 39

the same fault lies with the denial (by the Opponent) also —

BHĀṢYA

That is, the Denial also is 'inconclusive', it denies something, and does not deny other things, and being 'inconclusive', it cannot prove the desired conclusion.

Or, the Opponent having said—'If Sound be held to be *non-eternal*, there is no special reason why what happens to Sound, after Effort, is *production*, and not *manifestation*,'—[he is met by the First Party with the following *wrong answer*]—if Sound be held to be *eternal*, then also there is no special reason why what

* The Nyāyamañjarī remarks that by having selected the 'non-eternality of Sound' as the Example dealt with under all the twenty-four *Futile Rejoinders*, the author of the *Bhāṣya* has accomplished two purposes: he provides examples of the Rejoinders and also sets aside all possible objections against the Nyāya doctrine of the *Non-eternality of Sound*.

* Says the *Tatparya*—It has been shown up to the last Section that when the Opponent sets up a *Futile Rejoinder* he is met by the First Party with a suitable answer, and in every such case, the disputants come to an understanding as to the true conclusion. But there are cases where the First Party also meets the Opponent with a *wrong answer*, in that case no right conclusion is arrived at, and an entirely futile discussion is carried on, to six steps. This is what the author of the Sūtra proceeds to show, for the benefit of his pupils.

happens to Sound is *manifestation* not *production* Thus special reasons being equally wanting in both views both are equally *inconclusive*

Sūtra 40

The same may be said by the First Party in answer to all (Futile Rejoinders)—

BHĀṢYA

In connection with all that may be taken as the basis of the Futile Rejoinders—e g Similarity and the rest—whenever no special corroborative reason may be found—the contention may be put forward (by the First Party) that both views stand on the same footing

Sūtra 41

[*Fourth Step*] With the Contravention of the Denial also would lie the same fault as that which lies against the Denial itself

BHĀṢYA

It has been urged by the First Party that the fault of *Inconclusiveness* that had been urged (in the *Second Step*) as lying in the original Proposition lies also in the Denial (set up by the Opponent) But the same fault lies with this contravention of the Denial Thus then the *First Step* in this Futile Discussion consists in the propounding of the original proposition by the First Party—Sound is non eternal because it is the outcome of Effort—the *Second Step* consists of the denial or negative argument set up by the Opponent Critic in the form—Since the products of Effort are of several kinds there is Parity per Character of Effect this is what is called the Denial—then comes the *Third Step*—in which the First Party urges that the same fault lies with the Denial also this is what is called (in the *Sūtra*) *Vipratīśēdha* (Contravention)—then comes the *Fourth Step* (urged by the Opponent)—the same fault of Inconclusiveness lies also with the Contravention of the Denial

Sūtra 42

[*Fifth Step*—The contingency of the same fault lying with the Contravention of the denial is urged (by the Opponent) after admitting the presence of the fault in his

own contention,—and this involves 'Confession of the Contrary Opinion'—

BHĀṢYA

What the Opponent has done (in the *Fourth Step*) is to confess that the view he had expressed in the *Second Step* is faulty, and, without freeing his view from that defect he has admitted it and then has urged that the same fault of 'inconclusiveness' lies also with the Contravention of the Denial in the *Third Step*,—and on the part of the Opponent this involves a 'Confession of the Contrary Opinion' This is the *Fifth Step* [in the Futile Discussion]

Sūtra 43

[*Sixth Step*].—"It is after having admitted what has been urged against his own view, that the first party has urged the presence of the same fault (in the Opponent's view), and has put forward reasons for the same—in so doing he has admitted the presence (in his own view) of the fault urged against the Opponent's view—so that the fault of Confessing the contrary opinion is equally applicable to him also

BHĀṢYA

The fault urged against the original Proposition of the First Party was that 'there are several kinds of products of effort' (Su 37) and this is what, for the First Party who is propounding reasons in support of that proposition constitutes '*Svapaksalakṣaṇa*', 'fault urged against his own view—how?—because it arises out of his own view,—now what he has done (in course of the present Futile Discussion) is to admit this fault that has been urged against his view, and without refuting it, he has admitted it and urged the presence of the same fault in the words 'the same fault lies with the Denial also' (Su 39) and he has put forward reasons in support of the same—in the words 'the denial is inconclusive' Thus it being a case where he has admitted what has been urged against his view and urged the presence of the same fault in the Opponent's view and has put forward reasons for the same,—this means that he has admitted the presence in his own view of the fault he had urged against the Opponent's view *

* The right reading is परस्परदोषोऽभ्युपगमो भवति as found in C

'How so?' The Opponent had argued that 'there are several kinds of products of Effort', by which he meant to indicate 'the fault of inconclusiveness' (as lying against the original proposition),—without refuting this the First Party has said—'the same fault lies with the Denial also',—thus he has admitted that the arguments in support of the original proposition are faulty, and then urged the same against the Denial also, by doing so he admits the view of the Opponent, and becomes open to the same charge (of 'Confessing the Contrary Opinion') Just as the Opponent having admitted the faultiness of the Denial of the First Party, and having urged the presence of the same fault in the Contravention of the Denial also has been charged (in the *Fifth Step*) with 'Confession of the Contrary Opinion',—exactly in the same manner, the First Party also, having admitted the faultiness of the affirmation of the original Proposition, and having urged the presence of the same fault against the Denial, becomes open to the same charge of 'Confessing the Contrary Opinion'

This represents the *Sixth Step* in the Futile Discussion. Among the six steps, the *first*, *third* and *Fifth* steps represent the assertions of the Propounder of the Original Proposition, and the *second*, *fourth* and *sixth* represent those of the Opponent denying that Proposition. When we come to consider the validity and invalidity of those assertions, we find as follows — (a) Since there is no difference in the meaning of the *fourth* and the *sixth*, they are open to the charge of needless repetition, for what the *fourth* says is that 'with the Contravention of the Denial also would lie the same fault as that which lies with the Denial itself' (Su 41), which means that the other party is subject to the same fault,—and again in the *sixth* we have the assertion that by admitting the Opponent's view the First Party becomes open to the same charge, and this also means that the other party is open to the same fault, thus there is no difference in the meanings of these two — (b) The same charge of needless repetition lies also against the *third* and *fifth* steps, in the *third* what is alleged is that the same fault lies with the Denial also, which admits the equality of both views and again in the *fifth* it is admitted that the denial of the the Denial is subject to the same fault,—so that the *fifth* says nothing new — (c) Again

the *fifth* and *sixth* also are mere repetitions, there being no difference in what they allege—(d) The *third* and the *fourth* involve the 'Confession of the Contrary Opinion'—(e) In the *first* and the *second*, no special reasons have been adduced (in support of either view) Thus it is found that in the Futile Discussion consisting of the said six steps, neither of the two views becomes established

When does this Futile Discussion with the six steps, take place?—It takes place whenever the First Party begins the discussion with the contention that the same fault lies with the denial also, and in this case neither of the two views becomes demonstrated. When, however, the third step (in answer to the Opponent's denial which is the second step) is put forward by the First Party in the form—'Even though there are several kinds of Products, inasmuch as in the other kinds of Product causes of non apprehension are present, Effort could not be the cause of the manifestation of Sound' (Sū 38)—then the original view does become demonstrated, that 'What happens to Sound after Effort is that it comes into existence, and not that it becomes manifested', and in this case there is no room for the six steps of the Futile Discussion

*Thus ends the First Daily Lesson of the Fifth Adhyāya
of the Bhāṣya*

ADHYĀYA V
DAILY LESSON II

SECTION (1)

[Sūtras 1-6]

INTRODUCTORY BHĀṢYA

Dealing with the five Clinchers or Grounds of Defeat that bear upon the Proposition and the Statement of the Probans

Under Sū. 1-2 19 and 20 it has been briefly stated that—‘It is a case of Clincher when there is misapprehension, as also when there is non-apprehension, and there is a multiplicity of Clinchers owing to there being several varieties of both’; the same has now got to be described in detail. The Clinchers are actual occasions of defeat, the receptacles of faults; and they mostly bear upon the Proposition and other Factors of Reasoning, and they may affect the propounder of the true, as also that of the false, doctrine [but only so long as perfect wisdom has not been attained] They are divided as follows —

Sūtra 1

(1) Violating the Proposition, (2) Shifting the Proposition, (3) Contradicting the Proposition, (4) Renouncing the Proposition, (5) Shifting the the Probans, (6) Irrelevancy, (7) Meaningless Jargon, (8) Unintelligibility, (9) Incoherence, (10) Inconsequentiality, (11) Incompleteness, (12) Redundance, (13) Repetition, (14) Non-reproduction, (15) Incomprehension, (16) Embarrassment, (17) Evasion, (18) Confession of a Contrary Opinion, (19) Overlooking the Censurable, (20) Censuring of the non-censurable, (21) Inconsistency, and (22) Fallacious Probans are the Clinchers —

BHĀṢYA

All these, divided into twenty-two kinds, are defined one by one, in the following Sūtras.*

* These twenty two Clinchers have been grouped under seven heads, each of which is dealt with in the seven sections of this Daily Lesson

Sūtra 2

When the property of the 'counter-instance' (urged by the Opponent) is admitted by one to be present in the example cited by himself,—it is a case of (1) 'Violating the Proposition'.

BHĀṢYA

The Opposition having been set up on the basis of a certain property which is contrary to the Probandum,—if the First Party admits that that contrary property, which belongs to the Counter-instance cited by the Opponent, is present in the Example cited by himself, he violates his original Proposition, hence this becomes a case of 'Violating the Proposition' Example—The Proposition having been put forward in the form—'Sound must be non-eternal, because it is perceptible by the senses, like the Jar',—the Opponent says—"But we find that Community, which is eternal, is also perceptible by the senses, and why cannot Sound also be the same?"—Being met with this Opposition, the First Party may say—"if Community, which is perceptible by the senses, is eternal, the Jar also may be eternal", and in this the First Party attributes 'eternality' to the Example that he had cited in support of his proposition; and in so doing he violates his entire thesis up to the 'Final Conclusion', and violating his entire thesis, he is said to violate his Proposition,—since the Thesis rests in the Proposition *

Sūtra 3

The subject of the (original) Proposition having been denied, if the First Party finds a diversity in the properties (of the Example and the counter-instance), and puts it forward with a view to establish the former Proposition,—this is (2) 'Shifting the Proposition'.

* The *Bodhandhī* remarks that the Sūtra describes two kinds of 'Violating the Proposition'—the first is described by the very name 'Violating the Proposition', and another by the rest of the Sūtra. The example of the former kind would be that case when, on finding that he cannot bring forward arguments to sustain his position, the First Party entirely surrenders his point—"All right, I give up my point; Sound is not non-eternal." What is cited in the *Bhāṣya* is the example of the second kind.

BHĀṢYA

The '*subject of the original Proposition*' is—'Sound is non eternal, because it is perceptible by the Senses, like the Jar', this Proposition having been propounded (by the First Party), which consists in showing, by means of a counter instance, that the Probans (of the original Proposition) is not truly concomitant (with the Probandum),—'Community, which is perceptible by the senses, being *eternal*',—and the *subject of the original Proposition being thus denied*, the First Party finds a '*diversity in the properties of Example and the Counter-instance*',—i.e., he finds that while both (Jar and Community) have a certain property, *being perceptible by the senses*, in common, there are others in which they differ, e.g., Community is perceptible by the senses and *all pervading*, while the Jar is perceptible by the senses and *not-all pervading*, and perceiving this diversity of properties he puts it forward with a view to establish his former Proposition,—how?—[in this way]—'Just as the Jar is *not-all pervading*, so is Sound also *not-all pervading*, and hence like the Jar it should be *non-eternal* also',—now here the former Proposition was 'Sound is non-eternal', and 'Sound is not-all pervading' is a totally different Proposition,—this is thus an instance of '*Shifting the Proposition*'

"In what way does this become a *Ground of Defeat*, a Clincher?"

Well, as a matter of fact, one Proposition does not prove another Proposition, what prove a Proposition are the Probans and the Example, hence the putting forward (as proof) of what cannot prove the Proposition is entirely Futile, and being futile it becomes a '*Ground of Defeat*'.*

Sūtra 4

When there is contradiction between the Proposition and the Probans, it is (3) '*Contradiction of the Proposition*'

* Though when the First Party puts forward the fact of Sound being *not-all-pervading*, the idea in his mind is that, after having brought this home to the other party, he would add that as a qualifying clause to his original premiss—stating it in the form 'because Sound, *while being not-all pervading*, is perceptible by the senses (it must be non-eternal)',—yet until he actually does so, his position is clearly subject to the said Clincher—*Tātparya*

BHĀṢYA

The Proposition is stated in the form—'Substance must be something different from Quality', and the Statement of the Probans is in the form—'because no objects are ever perceived, except Colour etc.'—and there is a contradiction (conflict) between these, Proposition and Statement of the Probans—How?—If Substance is something different from Quality, then it is not possible that nothing except Colour etc. should be perceived,—while if nothing except Colour etc., is perceived, then it is not possible that Substance should be something different from Quality, thus there is a conflict between the two statements—(a) 'Substance must be different from Quality' and (b) 'Nothing except Colour etc. is perceived', i.e., the two are mutually Nugatory, and are impossible *

Sūtra 5

The original thesis having been opposed, if what was formerly affirmed happens to be retracted,—it is (4) 'Renouncing the Proposition'.

BHĀṢYA

The original thesis having been put forward in the form, "Sound is non-eternal because it is perceptible by the senses," the other party says—"Community is perceptible by the senses and is yet eternal, and similarly Sound also, which is perceptible by the senses, may be eternal",—and the original thesis being thus opposed, if the First Party happens, to say—"Who says that Sound is non-eternal?" This retraction of what had been affirmed in the Proposition is what is called 'Renouncing the Proposition' *

* The *Bodhisattva* remarks that the contradiction between the 'Proposition' and the 'Statement of the Probans' has been mentioned only by way of illustration, as a matter of fact, there is contradiction of the Proposition whenever there is any inconsistency between any two factors of the reasoning, and also when the Proposition is inconsistent with a well-ascertained fact.

* The Buddhist Logician Dharmakīrti has objected to this Clincher of 'Renouncing the Proposition', on the ground that the First Party having been already 'defeated' by the pointing out of the inconclusiveness of his Probans, there can be no need for any further 'ground of defeat'. The *Tālparyā* has answered this by saying that, as soon as the person finds that unless he renounces his proposition he shall be faced with the fallacy of

original substance subsisting in them¹, and this thus becomes a case of 'Shifting the Probans',

[The reason why this is a 'ground for defeat', is as follows]—The second (qualified) probans having been put forward, if the party mentions an Example in corroboration of what is stated in the Probans, then that *manifested thing*, which is cited as 'Example' (which, as example, cannot be included in the Proposition) ceases to be the emanation from a single origin, because, by its very nature (of Example) it must be the emanation from some other origin,*—if, on the other hand, no Example is cited, then the Probans not having its truth corroborated by a suitable Example, cannot prove that desired conclusion, so that the Probans turning out to be futile, the 'ground of defeat' remains in force

End of Section (1)

SECTION (2)

[*Sūtras 7—10*]

Dealing with the four Clinchers—(6), (7), (8) and (9) which consist in the non apprehension of what is needed for the desired purpose

Sūtra 7

The putting forward of statements bearing no connection with the purpose in hand constitutes (6) 'Irrelevancy'

BHĀṢYA

The thesis and counter thesis having been set up in the manner described above, the 'purpose in hand' being the proving of the Probandum by a proper Probans—the First Party might make the following statement—'That Sound is eternal is proved by the *Hetu*, because it is *intangible*' [having said so far he finds that his Probans is not valid, hence he goes on]—'the term *hetu* is a verbal noun derived from the root *hi* and affix *tan*,—a term is either a *Noun* or a *Verb* or a *Preposition*, or *Indeclinable*

* The proposition is in the form—'all manifested things are etc.', if the example is not included in this 'all', then what is predicated of the 'all' will not be true of the Example, if the Example is also included in it, then no Example can be possible

Particle;—the *Noun* is that word which has its form qualified by the fact of the thing denoted by it having a distinct action,—the *Verb* is either (a) an aggregate of the action and the active agencies, or (b) that which denotes the presence in the active agent, of a certain action qualified by a definite time and number,* or (c) that which is simply expressed by the root and is qualified by a particular time,—the *Indeclinables* are those that, in actual usage, have no denotation apart from what is expressed by the *Noun* or the *Verb*,—the *Prepositions* are used as prefixes and serve to qualify the action denoted by the *Verb*,—and so forth, [all which has nothing to do with the proving of his Proposition], and this constitutes 'Irrelevancy'.

Sūtra 8

That which is like the mere repeating of the letters of alphabet is (7) 'Meaningless Jargon'

BHĀṢYA

E g, 'Sound is eternal, because *ka-ca ṣa-ta pa* are *ja-ba ga-da-das*', † like *ṣha-bha-ṇa-gha-dha-dha-ṣ*',—such statements are absolutely meaningless. Since the mere letters of the alphabet can have no denotation, they cannot express anything; hence it is the mere letters that are repeated in a certain order §

Sūtra 9

If the assertion made is such that, though stated three times, it fails to be understood by the audience and the Second Party, it is a case of (8) 'Un-intelligibility'—

BHĀṢYA

If the assertion is made and is not understood by the audience and the Second Party, even though stated three times—and this happens when the assertion consists of words with double meanings, or of such words as are not met with in ordinary

* The right reading in all Mss. is वाक्कर्मव्यापिशिष्ट.

† The right reading is supplied by B and D-बच्चटनपानी जवगददशनात्.

§ No such argument is found in actual usage. The *Tātparyya* points out that we have an example of this when the Drāviḍa puts forward his argument, for the convincing of an Aryan, in his own Vernacular, which conveys no idea to the latter, who is ignorant of the Dravidian tongue, and for whom the words of that language are only so many letter sounds.

usage, or when the words are uttered too hurriedly and so forth,—this constitutes 'Unintelligibility', since the man makes use of unintelligible expressions intentionally, with a view to cover the weakness of his reasonings,—this constitutes a 'Ground of Defeat'.

Sūtra 10

In a case where, there being no connection between the expressions following one another, they are found to afford no connected meaning, it is a case of (9) 'Incoherence'.

DIĀṢYA

In a case where, either among several words or several sentences, there is no possibility of proper sequence and connection,—and hence the whole is found to be disconnected,—since there is no meaning obtained from the words or sentences taken collectively, it is a case of 'Incoherence' *E.g.* (a) 'Ten pome granates, six cakes' (where there is no connection between the two sentences), (b) 'Cup—goatskin—flesh—lump—deer skin*—of the Virgin—to be drunk—her father—devoid of character' † Where the words have no connection among themselves

End of Section (2)

SECTION (3)

[Sūtras 11-13]

Dealing with the (10), (11) and (12) Clinchers—which consist in the wrong presentment of one's case

Sūtra 11

When the factors of reasoning are stated in the reversed order, it is a case of (10) 'Inconsequentiality'

DIĀṢYA

Among the several Factors of Reasoning, Proposition and the rest, there is a definite natural order, in which they are stated,—which is based upon the nature of what is expressed by each of them, and when a statement is made in which this natural order is reversed,—it becomes a case of that 'Ground of Defeat', which

* C and B and D read रौषकम्

† C and D read अमतिशोऽल.

is called 'Inconsequentiality' which means that what is expressed by the several Factors is not found to form a connected whole

Sūtra 12

That which is wanting in any one of the Factors of Reasoning is (1) the 'Incomplete'—

BHĀṢYA

When the statement is wanting in any one of the Factors of Reasoning—Proposition and the rest—it is a case of the 'Ground of Defeat' called 'Incompleteness' for in the absence of a complete statement of the reasoning, the desired conclusion cannot be established

Sūtra 13

That which contains superfluous Probans' and 'Example' is the (12) Redundant'—

BHĀṢYA

One alone being sufficient for the purpose in view, (when more than one Probans or Examples are put forward), one or the other must be superfluous. This, however, is to be regarded as a 'Ground of Defeat' only when there is a restriction (placed upon the speaker, in regard to stating *only* what is actually necessary for his proposition)

End of Section (3)

SECTION (4)

[*Sūtras 14-15*]

Sūtra 14

Dealing with the Clincher (13) Repetition

The re statement of Words and Ideas constitutes 'Repetition'—except in the case of Reproduction

BHĀṢYA

Except in the case of Reproduction, (a) 'Repetition' of Words and (b) Repetition of Ideas (constitute 'grounds of defeat'), e.g. (a) 'Sound is eternal, Sound is eternal,' here we have 'repetition of words', and (b), 'Sound is non-eternal, Intonation is liable to destruction', here we have the 'repetition of the Idea' (of Sound

being not everlasting) In the case of 'Reproduction' it is not 'Repetition' (a Ground of Defeat), because in that case the re-statement serves an additional purpose, when for instance, 'the re statement of the Proposition on the basis of the Statement of the Probans constitutes the Final Conclusion' (Sū 1 1-39)

Sūtra 15

The actual statement by means of directly expressive words of what is already implied—

BHĀṢYA

is *Repetition*,*—this term coming in from the preceding Sūtra

Example [of this second kind of Repetition]—Having as asserted that 'Sound is non eternal, because it has the character of being produced', if the man goes on to add 'only that which does not have the character of being produced can be eternal, which words are expressive of the idea that is already got by 'implication'—this should be regarded as 'Repetition', because words are used only for the purpose of conveying a meaning, and when this has already been done by implication [the actual using of words to the same effect is superfluous]

End of Section (4)

SECTION (5)

[Sūtras 16-19]

Dealing with the four Clinchers—(14), (15) (16) and (17)—which denote incompatibility with the right method of Answer

Sūtra 16

If the First Party fails to re state what has been stated (by the Second Party) three times, and duly understood by the audience it is a case of (14) 'Non reproduction'.

BHĀṢYA

When the meaning of the sentence has been duly understood by the audience, and it has been stated by the Opponent three times—if the First Party fails to re state it, it is a 'Ground of

* The Nyāyasūtrānibandha the Tatparya and Sū Ms D makes 'पुनरुक्तम्' part of the Sūtra 15 itself but this is not in keeping with the Bhāṣya

Sūtra 22

When one party urges a 'Clincher' when there is no 'Clincher' (incurred by the other party),—it is a case of (20) 'Censuring the Un-censurable'

BHĀṢYA

It is only when the man has a wrong conception of the true character of the 'Clincher' that he can urge—'You are defeated'—against the other Party, who in fact, has *not* rendered himself subject to a 'Clincher,' and in doing so, since he would be censuring one who does not deserve to be censured, he should be regarded as 'defeated' *

Sūtra 23

Having taken up one standpoint, if the party carries on the discussion without restriction,—it is a case of (21) 'Inconsistency'—

BHĀṢYA

Having affirmed a certain character in regard to a thing, if the party carries on further discussion *without restriction*—i.e., even contrary to the view taken up before—it should be regarded as a case of 'Inconsistency' Eg 'An entity never renounces itself,—there can be no distinction in what exists—that which is non-existent can never come into existence,—no non-existent thing is ever produced', having taken up this standpoint, the *Sāṅkhya* goes on to establish this thesis in the following manner—'All that is manifested must be regarded as emanating from a single origin, because there is a common substratum running through all emanations—and in the case of the Earthen Cup and such things it is found that they have the substratum of *Clay* running through them all, and are the emanations from a single origin—and all manifested things are found

* This is not the same as 'Embarrassment' as in this latter the man does not know what to say in answer while in Censuring the Un-censurable he says something as the *answer* which is not an answer at all. It is for this reason that this 'Clincher' includes all *Futile Replies*. The difference between this and 'Fallacious Probans' lies in this that the 'Fallacious Probans' when pointed out, tends to the 'defeat' of the propounder of the argument, while 'Censuring the Un-censurable' is urged against the person who is answering an argument—*Tatparjya*

to have Pleasure, Pain, and Delusion running through them all,—and from seeing the subsistence of this common substratum in these—Pleasure, Pain, and Delusion,—we conclude that the whole of this Universe must be the emanation from a single origin' *—When he has said this he is met (by the Logician) with the following question—'How is it to be determined that a certain thing is the *origin*, and another the *emanation*?'—Thus questioned, *Sāṅkhya* answers—'That which itself remains constant while one character of it ceases to exist and another comes into existence is the *origin* and the character that ceases to exist and comes into existence is the *emanation*.'†

Now here we find that the *Sāṅkhya* has carried on discussion without any restriction, without regard to the view taken up by him before, in fact even contrary to the opinion accepted before. For the opinion accepted by him at the outset was—'the non-existent can never come into existence—the existent cannot cease to exist', and it is a well-known fact that unless there is cessation of existence of what has been existent, or 'coming into existence' of what has been non-existent, there can be no disappearance or appearance, e.g. when, the Clay remaining constant, its own character, in the shape of the Cup, comes into existence, it is said to *appear*, and when it has ceased to exist, it is said to *disappear*,—all this should not be possible (according to the *Sāṅkhya* standpoint) even in connection with the character of the Clay. Having all this urged against himself, if the *Sāṅkhya* comes to admit that what is *existent* does *cease to exist*, and what is *non-existent* *does come into existence*,—then he becomes subject to the Clincher of 'Inconsistency', while if he does not admit the said facts, his thesis fails to be established §

* The right reading is एकममृतार विश्वमिति, as found in D

† The best reading of this passage is found in the *Tālparya* and D—यस्यावस्थितस्य धर्मान्तरनिवृत्तौ यद्वर्गान्तरं प्रवर्तते सा मृत्तिः यद्वर्गान्तरमप्रवर्तते निवर्तते, व.म. त्रिकार, इति. In the case of the Jar, the Clay is the constant factor, while the varying shapes of the Jar, Cup etc. are the *emanations*

§ Without the said fact, no distinction is possible between *Origin* and *Emanation*, and without this distinction, the Original Proposition of the *Sāṅkhya* can have no meaning

Sūtra 24

(22) The 'Fallacious Probans' also, (are Clinchers) as they have been already described

BHĀṢYA

The 'Fallacious Probans' also are 'Grounds of Defeat' *Question*—'Is it on account of the presence of some other character that the Fallacious Probans comes to be regarded as *Clinchers*—just in the same way as the 'Instruments of Cognition come to be regarded as Objects of Cognition'?"

In answer to this the *Sūtra* says—as *they have been described*, i.e., it is in the character of the 'Fallacious Probans' itself that they become 'Grounds of Defeat' (Clinchers) also

Thus have the Instruments of Right Cognition and other categories been duly *mentioned, defined* and *examined*

The Science of Reasoning that revealed itself to the Sage Akṣapāda the chief of exponents,—of that Vatsyayana has pounded the Commentary

Thus ends the Second Daily Lesson of the Fifth Discourse in the *Bhāṣya* of Vatsyayana

FINIS

INDEX-GLOSSARY

A

Absurdity (अविज्ञाततत्त्वं),	73	Apavarga (ultimate good),	46
Activity (प्रवृत्ति),	12, 42, 408	Appearance, non, of cognition (ज्ञानानुत्पत्ति),	41
Activity and absence of in axe (आरम्भनिवृत्तिदर्शनं)	367	Apprehension (बुद्धि, उपलब्धि),	41, 339
Action, Vehicle of (घेष्टाश्रय),	36	Apprehension, destruction of wrong and true knowledge (मिथ्याफलविधिविनाश),	492
Adristartha (अदृष्टार्थ),	30	Apprehension, evanescent (बुद्धे उत्पन्नापवर्गित्वम्),	379
Admission sought (अनवरथायि ग्रह),	381	Apprehension negation of (अनुपलब्धभासवत्त्वं उपलब्धे),	213, 527
Air (वायु),	38	Apprehension, no quality of mind (ज्ञेयाननुपलब्धि मनस),	57
Akaśa (आकाश),	38	Argument, failure of (पक्षप्रति- पेक्ष),	215
Akaśa all pervading (सर्व व्यापित्वं),	482	Ascertainment (अवधानं)	76
Akaśa non pervading (आकाश सर्वगतत्वं),	482	Artha (अर्थ),	39
Akaśa, properties of (आकाश धर्मा),	483	Assertion of a reliable person (आश्रयोपदेश)	29
Allpervasiveness (विधुरत्वं),	483	Atom beyond Diad (आकाशो त्पत्ति)	481
Analogy (उपमानं),	16, 17, 28	Atom beyond sense (अती न्द्रियव्यवहृत्तानाम्),	154
Analogy based on Resemblance (एकदेशसाधर्म्योपमानं),	173	Atoms eternal (अणुनिश्चयम्),	214
Annoyance (पाथना),	45	Atom, no product (संयोगोत्पत्ति अणूनाम्),	484
Analogy, non different (अवि- शिष्टोपमानं)	172	Atom without parts (निरवयवार्थ अणूनाम्),	81
Analogy, non perfect (असाधर्म्यो- पमानं),	172	Audition, organ of (श्रुति अयन),	326
Annihilation (अपाय),	12	Aversion (द्वेष),	34
Antithesis (अभाव),	195		
Antithesis before existence (अभावोत्पत्ति),	201		
Antithesis no (असत्याभाव),	200		
Antithesis, Valid (अभावाप्रामाण्यं),	199		

B

- Birth (जन्मन्), 12
 Body (शरीरं), 36
 Body composed of earth (पार्थिवं शरीरं), 287
 Body composed of five elements (पाचभौतिक शरीरं), 289
 Body everlasting (प्रायणम्), 403
 Body formation through material substance (मृत्युत्पादनत्वं शरीरस्य), 395
 Body like eternality of dark colour of atom (अणुद्रव्यमतानित्यत्वं शरीरस्य), 404
 Body, nature of (शरीरपरीक्षा), 286
 Body through non-perception (अदृष्टकारित्वं शरीरस्य), 400
 Body through persistence (पूर्वं कृतफलानुबन्धत्वं शरीरस्य), 394
 Body thrh Destiny (अदृष्टनिष्पाद्यत्वं शरीरस्य) 393
 Buddhi (बुद्धि), 42
 Buddhi, Destruction of, from another apprehension (बुद्धयन्तरात् बुद्धिविनाशः), 356
 Buddhi, a Quality of Soul (आत्मगुणता बुद्धेः), 351, 355
 Buddhi, Transcience of (बुद्धयन्तित्वता), 337
 Being born again (पुनरत्पत्ति), 44

C

- Casuistry (आमान छल), 4, 83, 97
 Casuistry figurative (उपचार छल), 97, 101
 Casuistry generalising (सामान्य-छल), 97, 99

- Casuistry verbal (वाक्यछलः), 97
 Categories (भेदः), 3
 Cause, original as enlarged modification (विकारविबुद्धि), 228
 Cause and production actually perceived (कारणोत्पत्त्युपलब्धि), 429
 Cessation (अपाय), 12
 Censuring uncensurable (अनुक्त-स्यार्थोपपत्ति), 552
 Character, cognition of (समान-धर्मोपपत्ति), 57
 Character, ascertainment of (अर्थावधारण), 76
 Chance-theory (आकस्मिकत्वं), 425
 Character, real (तत्त्व), 73
 Clinchers (निग्रहस्थानं), 4, 83, 105
 Conclusion, final (निगमन) 61
 Cogitation (ऊहः, तर्कः), 3
 Cognition (प्रमाण, ज्ञाने), 34, 41
 Cognition, Analogical (उपमान-परीक्षा), 72
 Cognition, non appearance of (अनुपलब्धि), 41
 Cognition, simultaneous (युगपद-ग्रहण बुद्धेः), 339
 Cognition, cessation of (बुद्धि-विनाश), 339
 Cognition forming soul (ज्ञान-लिंगत्वं आत्मनः), 141
 Cognition, instrument of (अ-प्रामाण्य), 118
 Cognition, right instrument to magical phenomena (माया गद्यर्चनगरमृगमृत्पिनावज्ज्ञानं), 489
 Cognition, object of (प्रमेयं), 3
 Cognition non simultaneous (ज्ञानायोगपद्य), 141, 390

- Cognition composite (एकदेशो-
पलब्धि), 148
- Cognition, not of two diverse
processes (अदिप्रवृत्ति उपलब्धि)
177
- Cognition of presence un-
marked (अलक्षितापलब्धि), 200
- Cognition inexplicable (युगपज्ज्ञे-
यानुपलब्धि), 353
- Cognition, restriction of (क्षम-
वृत्तित्वाभावाद् बुद्धे), 119
- Cognition perceptible (प्रत्यक्षो-
पलब्धि), 147
- Cognition, means of (प्रमाण-
चतुष्टय), 195
- Cognition by antithesis (अभाव-
प्रामाण्य), 195
- Cognition, transient charac-
ter of (बुद्ध्यनिरयता), 332
- Colour (रूप), 39
- Colour apparent to baking
(पाकजगुणान्तरोत्पत्ति), 355
- Colour and other qualities in
Body (शरीरमावित्व), 384
- Community eternal (सामान्य-
नित्यत्व), 205
- Composite several in places
(अवयविनानाम्थानत्व), 308
- Composite wholes, nature of
(अवयविपरीक्षा), 150
- Concatenation, innate (हेतु-
संततिस्वाभाविकत्व), 464
- Conception (पक्ष), 30
- Conclusion final (निगमन), 70
- Conclusion definite (प्रकरण-
विन्ता), 89
- Concomitance invariable
(नैकप्रत्यनीकार्थ), 411
- Condemnation, sense of (उपा-
हम), 80, 455
- Consciousness different from
Qualities of body (शरीरगुण-
बंधम्यबुद्धि), 388
- Consciousness no Quality of
Body (शरीरगुणव्यतिरेकबुद्धि),
383
- Consciousness pervading over
body (शरीरव्यापिनी बुद्धि), 387
- Constancy (नित्यत्व) 239
- Components and Composites
stealing with (अवयवावय-
वित्वपरीक्षा), 472
- Composite, absence of (अवयव्य-
भाव), 473
- Confessing contrary opinion
(प्रतिषेद्धव्याप्रतिषेध), 551
- Configuration (आकृति), 249
- Connection, specification
(संबन्ध) 1
- Contact, taking place (संनिकर्षो-
त्पत्ति), 303
- Contact, particular (संयोग-
विशेष), 360
- Contact painful (संयोगविशेष-
व्यथन), 361
- Contraction (व्याघात), 184
- Contradictory (विरोध), 86, 88
- Conviction (संमति), 58
- Conviction, certainty of (संमति-
पत्ति), 109
- Conviction, philosophical
(सर्वतन्त्रसिद्धान्त), 59
- Contraction, self (व्याहृतत्व),
144
- Counter Conception प्रतिपक्ष),
80

Cutaneous (तर्क),	37	Doctrine (सिद्धान्त),	59
Contrary (विपरीत),	67	Doctrine, common (सर्वतन्त्र सिद्धान्त),	59

D

Deduction (संभव),	195
Defect (दोष),	12, 43, 409
Defects in three groups (दोष-त्रयाश्च),	410
Defined, well (व्यवसायात्मक),	17
Demolition (उपघात),	163
Denial, invalid (प्रतिषेधाप्रामाण्य),	198
Denial, no (प्रतिषेधानुपपत्ति),	123
Deprecatory description (निन्दा),	188
Descriptions, narrative (पुरा कल्प),	188
Desire (इच्छा),	34
Desire and aversion to cognisant beings (इच्छाद्वेषनिमित्तत्वं),	366
Destiny, cause of body formation (शरीरोत्पत्तिनिमित्तत्वं),	397
Discussion (निर्णयवाद),	4, 80
Discussion, futile six steps (षट् पक्षरूपकथाभास),	535
Disputation (जल्प),	4, 83
Distinguishing (विप्रतिपत्ति),	53
Dissimilarity (वैधर्म्य),	64, 104
Diversity-all (सर्ववृथक्त्वं),	433
Diversity, cognition of (विप्रतिपत्ति),	109
Doubt (संशय),	3, 52
Doubt from action (कर्मसाध्यत्व संशय),	332
Doubt, defined (संशयपरीक्षा),	107
Doubt, possibility of (संशय-विशेषापेक्षा),	111

Doctrine, hypothetical (अभ्युपगम),	59
Doctrine, peculiar (प्रतितन्त्र सिद्धान्त),	59
Doctrine on implication (अधि-करणसिद्धान्त),	59
Dristartha (दृष्टार्थ),	30

E

Earth (पृथ्वी),	38
Earthly and aqueous substance perceived (पार्थिवान्ध्यप्रत्यक्षत्वम्),	323
Effort (प्रयत्न),	34
Embarrassment (अहेतु),	550
Entities produced out of negations (अभावास्तिति),	417
Erroneous (अव्यभिचारिन्),	19
Eternal cause undeniable (सर्वा नित्यत्वनिराकरण),	427
Evanescent non-eternal (अनित्यत्व),	427
Evasion (भसिद्धि),	550
Example (दृष्टान्त),	3, 57
Example, effective reason (प्रति-दृष्टान्तहेतुत्वं),	514

F

Falsity (अनृत),	184
Fallacious, probans (प्रति-पेक्षाभाव),	554
Fire (तेज),	38
Flux, perpetual (भाषोद्धातिकम्),	344
Freedom, absolute (अत्यन्त विमोक्ष),	46

Fruition (फल),	44
Fruition, impossible (अनिष्पत्ति),	445
Fruit not immediate (कालान्तरोपभोग्य फल),	444
Fruition, non existant (अस्तत्फल),	446
Fruitlessness of man's actions (पुरुषकर्मफल्य, पुरुषकर्माभाव),	421

G

Gestation (रस),	32
Gastatory (रसन),	37
Gold-character non absent. (सुवर्णपुनरापश्यहेतु),	233
God, cause of universe (ईश्वरोपादानता),	420
Ground, present and undeniable (प्रतिरष्टान्वहेत्वभाव),	515

H

Holding, possibility of (धारणा-कर्णोत्पत्ति),	151
---	-----

I

Idea of has been done, and to be done (कृतताकर्तव्यतोपपत्ति),	171
Idea, both ways of (उपपत्त्युभयभा-सृष्टेर्),	171
Illusion, different (दोषान्तराभाव)	413
Illusion under defect (दोषरक्षणायरोध),	413
Illusion, worse, evil (मोहपापी-चर्य),	412

Illustrative description (परकीर्ति),	188
Incoherence (अपार्यंकम्),	547
Incomplete (न्यूनम्),	548
Incomprehension (अग्रतिपत्ति),	105, 550
Incongruity, absence of in-colour (रूपाद्यप्रतिषेध),	389
Inconsistency (अपसिद्धान्त),	552
Inciting (प्रवर्तन),	43
Incantation, trustworthiness of (मन्त्राद्युद्येदाप्रामाण्यत्वम्),	191
Inconclusive (सध्यभिचार),	86
Inconsequentiality (अप्राप्तकार-त्ता),	547
Inconstancy original (प्रकृत्य-नियम),	238
Indecision (अनेकान्तिकता),	86
Indication (लिंग),	34
Individuality, specific (गुण-विशेषाश्रय),	249
Individual (मूर्ति),	249
Inference (अनुमान),	16, 25
Inference, factors of (अनुमाना-ययथा),	3
Inference, no right conception (अनुमानाप्रामाण्यम्),	163
Instance, strength of (उदाहरणा-पेक्षा),	69
Injunctions, prescribing (विधि-विधायकाद्य),	183
Instance, familiar (रष्टान्त),	65
Instance, corroborative (उदा-हरण),	61
Intangibility (अस्पन्दत्व),	214
Intellection (बुद्धि),	41
Investigator, trained (परीक्षक),	57

Irrelevancy (अव्यन्तरम्),	545	Longing, due to anticipation	
Incapacity (पुरुषाशक्ति),	404	(रागादिसंवल्लभनिमित्तत्वम्),	284

J

Judgment, wavering (विमर्श),	53
Jalpa (जल्प),	83
Jargon, meaningless (निरर्थत्वम्),	546

K

Kalatita (कालतीत),	86
Killing receptacle of effects (कार्योद्भवकतृबध),	260
Knowledge true (तत्त्वज्ञान),	467
Knowledge, true development of (तत्त्वज्ञानविवृद्धि),	494
Knowledge, true guarding of (तत्त्वज्ञानपरिपालन),	500

L

Letters, coalescent (वर्णसंक्षेप),	240
Letters, curtailment of (वर्णलेश),	240
Letters, diminution of (वर्ण ऋण),	240
Letters increase of (वर्णविवृद्धि),	240
Letters eternal (वर्णनित्यत्वम्),	234
Letters, modification of (वर्ण विवर्तोपपत्ति),	240
Letters suppressive (वर्णोपसद),	240
Letters, coming of properties (वर्णगुणान्तरापरिण),	240
Limitating in actual use (जाति- विशेषान्निवृत्ति),	183

M

Magnet (अयस्कान्त),	
Misapprehension (विप्रतिपत्ति),	105
Magnitude, concealment of,	41
Manas (मानस-मन),	41
Matter, open to doubt (द्रव्य संशय),	384
Mind (मन),	32
Mind, treating of (मन परीक्षा)	390
Mistimed (कालानीत),	86
Mind contact with sense, im- possible (मनोऽर्थेयानुपलब्धि),	355
Mind in body (मनोऽन्तर्गतर वृत्तिरत्व),	357
Mind in movement (आश्रुगतिरत्व मनस),	359
Modification unequal (विवर्त विकल्परत्व),	230
Modification impossible in letters (विवर्तधर्मानुपपत्ति),	231
Modification larger and smaller (न्यूनतमधिकोपलब्धि),	228
Motion (गति),	158
Motion, non eternal (कर्मनित्यत्व),	214
Motive (प्रयोजन),	3, 56
Movement, apprehension of feeling (वर्णानवस्थापिप्रवृत्तम्),	379
Multiplicity (बहुत्व),	106

N

Neutralised (प्रकरणयम),	46
-------------------------	----

Nimitta (निमित्तं),	425	Odour (गन्धः),	39
Nirnaya (निर्णयः),	76	Olfactory (घ्राणः),	37
Non apprehension to mind (अप्रत्यभिज्ञानः),	340	Olfaction, organ of (घ्राणः),	326
Non difference (अविशेषः),	217	Oppression with frailty (माघना निवृत्तिः),	452
Non eternality of non eternal (नित्यत्वापत्तेः प्रतिषेधाभावात्),	532	Organ, auditory (श्रोत्रः),	37
Non perception (अनुपलब्धिः),	347	Organ, visual refuted (चक्षुरद्वैत- निराकरणम्),	262
Non perception due to non- manifestation (अनाभिव्यक्तितोऽ नुपलब्धिः),	299	Organ as prepondering (पूर्वपूर्व गुणात्कारः),	326
No perception—no proof of non existence (अनुपलब्धिपरभाव हेतुः),	294	Overlooking the censurable (प्रतिपक्षसिद्धेः अर्थापत्तिस्त्वम्),	557
Non reproduction (प्रक्रियासिद्धिः),	549	Operation (आरम्भः, अध्यवसायः),	42
		Opinion, Diversity of (विप्रति- पत्तिः),	109

P

Notion, analogous to notion of Diversity (अन्यत्वाभिमानः),	342	Pain (दुःखम्),	12, 34, 45
Notion, wrong (मिथ्याज्ञानं),	12	Pain engrossed in Birth and body (जन्मोत्पत्तिदुःखम्),	451
Number, absolute Limitation of (संख्येयकान्तसिद्धिः),	442	Pain, nature of (दुःखपरीक्षा),	449
Nature (अभ्युपगमः),	58	Parity per apprehension (उप- लब्धिसमत्वं),	525
		Parity per continued question (प्रसंगसमः),	513
Objects, certain extremely powerful (अभ्यविशेषप्राबल्यम्),	496	Parity, per character of effect (कायसमत्वं),	533
Objects, cognition of, in dreams (स्वप्नविषयाभिमानः),	490	Parity, per counter instance (प्रतिरुद्धान्तः),	511
Objects, corporeal with shape (सव्योमोपपत्तिः),	484	Parity, per doubt (संशयसमः),	516
Obstructions (रोधः),	163	Parity, per non eternality (अ- नित्यसमत्वं),	531
Objects, many (विषयबाहुल्यं),	314	Parity, per evidence (उपपत्तिसमः),	524
Obstruction, existence of (आवरोधोपलब्धिः),	211	Parity per Dissimilarity (वैधर्म्यः),	503
Obstruction, non apprehension of (अनावरोधोपलब्धिः),	212	Parity, per Neutralisation (प्रक- रणसमः),	517

- Parity, per Non-apprehension (अनुपलब्धिप्रकरणम्), 526
- Parity, per Non-eternality (अनित्यसम), 529
- Parity, per Non-generation (अनुत्पत्तिसम), 515
- Parity, per Non probativeness (अहेतुसम), 519
- Parity, per presumption (अर्थापत्तिसम), 54
- Parity, per Non difference (अविशेषसम), 522
- Parity, per simplicity (साधर्म्यम्), 504
- Parity per Augmentation (उत्कर्षसम), 503
- Parity per subtraction (अपकर्षसम), 503
- Parity per Uncertainty (वर्ण्यसम), 503
- Parity per Certainty (अवर्ण्यसम), 503
- Parity per Shuffling (विकल्पसम), 503
- Parity per Probandum (साध्यसम), 503
- Parity per Convergence (प्राप्ति-सम), 503
- Parity per Non convergence (अप्राप्तिसम), 503
- Parity per Vacillation (प्रकरण-सम), 503
- Parity per Eternality (नित्यसम), 503
- Parents cause of body form (मातापित्रौ उत्पत्तिनिमित्तत्वम्), 395
- Perception (प्रत्यक्षं), 16, 118
- Perception, cause of (प्रत्यक्ष-निमित्तत्वं), 141
- Perception, examination of (प्रत्यक्षपरीक्षा), 139
- Perception in contact with Soul and Body (आत्ममनसो प्रत्यक्षत्वम्), 139
- Perception, indistinct (अव्यक्त-ग्रहणम्), 387
- Perception-inferential cogni-
tion (प्रत्यक्षानुमानत्वं), 145
- Perception impossible (प्रत्यक्षा-
नुपपत्ते सर्वाग्रहणं), 170
- Perception, like, per of fire cir-
cle (अलातचक्रदर्शनोपलब्धि), 391
- Presumption, invalidity in (अर्थापत्यप्रामाण्यम्), 199
- Perception, same as Inference (प्रत्यक्षानुमानत्वं), 4
- Perception of space and time
etc (दिग्देशकालाकाशप्रत्यक्षो-
पपत्ति), 140
- Phala (फल), 54
- Philosophy (तन्त्राधिकरण), 58
- Pleasure (सुख), 34
- Pleasure during intervals (सुखस्य अन्तरालनिष्पत्ति), 457
- Possibility of differentiation (व्यवस्थानुपपत्ति), 432
- Prakaranamsa (प्रकरणाश), 86
- Praman (प्रमेय), 16
- Praman, Denial of (सर्वप्रमाण-
विप्रतिषेध), 125
- Praman, examination of (प्रमाण-
सामान्यपरीक्षा), 117
- Praman, preliminary survey of (प्रमाणलक्षणम्), 16

- Prameya (प्रमेय), 123
 Prapti (combination) (प्राप्ति), 160
 Prayojan (प्रयोजनम्), 65
 Pravritti (प्रवृत्ति), 42
 Pretyabhāva (प्रेत्याभाव), 44
 Premises untrue (अनुमाना
 प्रामाण्यम्), 163
 Presumption undecided (अनि-
 कान्तिकत्व अर्थापत्ते), 521
 Presence cognitions of percep-
 tible (भावाभावसवेदनम्), 529
 Presumption untrue (अर्थापत्य-
 प्रामाण्यम्), 197
 Presumption same as Inference
 (अनुमानार्थापत्यसम्भव), 196
 Probandum (साध्यनिर्देश) 63
 Probans fallacious (हेत्वाभास), 86
 Probans different (अनुमानार्था-
 न्तराभाव), 165
 Probans, statement of (अनुमान
 हेतु), 61
 Probans unknown (साध्याविशिष्ट), 91
 Probandum proved by probans
 (साध्यमिदिहेतु), 520
 Production, cause of, perceived
 (उत्पत्तिविनाशोपलब्धि), 347
 Production of entities, not
 without cause (अनिमित्तत्व), 425
 Production no—out of thing
 destroyed (अनिप्यत्ति), 419
 Proof—presence of (उद्), 73
 Proposition (प्रतिज्ञा), 70
 Proposition, contradiction of
 (प्रतिज्ञापनम्), 542
 Purvavat (the inference) (पूर्व-
 वदनुमानम्), 25, 26
 Purpose, enunciation of (प्रयो-
 जनप्रकरणम्), 1
- R**
- Reaffirmation (उपनय), 61, 69, 510
 Reasoning (न्यायस्वरूप), 61
 Reasoning, defects of, due to
 incapacity (पुरुषाशक्तिक्रिमदोष-
 सामान्यलक्षणम्), 104
 Reasoning, factors of (न्याय-
 स्वरूपावयवा), 61, 125
 Reason, fallacious (हेत्वाभास), 4
 Reasoning involving self con-
 tradictions (व्याघाताप्रयोग), 418
 Reasoning, unconventional
 (शब्दार्थसम्यक्सामयिकत्वम्), 182
 Reasoning, preliminaries of
 (न्यायपूर्वगलक्षणम्), 37
 Reasoning unsound (व्याहृतत्व), 143
 Reason, validity of (उपलब्ध्य-
 प्रतिषेध), 215
 Repeating word (शब्दान्यासो-
 पपत्ति), 190
 Rebirth (प्रेत्याभाव), 44, 413
 Rebirth possible, soul being
 eternal (आत्मनित्यत्वप्रेत्याभाव-
 सिद्धि), 414
 Recognition as invalid reason
 (साध्यसमत्वबुद्धि), 335
 Recognition, rise of (बुद्ध्युत्पत्ति), 377
 Recognition of things (विषय
 मध्यभिज्ञानम्), 334

- Recollection proceeding from contact of mind (बुद्धगन्तर-विनाश), 357
- Recollection unrestricted to time (स्मरणकालानियम), 359
- Recollection not simultaneous (अयुगपरस्मरणम्), 362
- Recollecting persons retaining a body (स्मरन्तर्निधार्णोपपत्ति), 358
- Recrudescence, no (प्रतिमथान-प्रवृत्ति), 463
- Redundancy (अधिकम्), 548
- Reiteration (अनवस्थाकारित्व), 187
- Regress infinite, not right (अनवस्थानुपपत्त्यप्रतिषेध), 485
- Reiteration with purpose (अनुवाद), 189
- Reiteration, same as repetition (अनुवादपुनरुक्त्यविशेष), 190
- Release possible (अपवर्ग), 463
- Release, denial of, not right (समाश्लेषणहमाप्रतिषेध), 461
- Release final (अपवर्ग), 46, 454
- Release, final, on contingency (अपवर्गप्रसंग), 497
- Remembrance, the quality of soul (आत्मगुणत्वसद्भाव), 269
- Rejoinder, futile (उल्लासि), 4, 83, 502
- Rejoinder, Denial of (अभिचारा-प्रतिषेध), 512
- Relationship, presence of (संबन्धोपलक्षि), 178
- Renouncing the proposition (प्रतिज्ञानन्वासा), 543
- Repetition (पुनर्वचनम्, पुनरुक्तम्), 548
- Resemblance (समत्वे), 163
- Remembrance and its objects (स्मर्तव्यविषयत्वम्), 268
- Restriction due to preponderance (व्यवस्थानभूयस्त्वम्), 328
- Results occurring to man are acts done by others (अद्वि-भ्यागम्), 372
- Results adduced by elimination firmly established (यथोक्त-हेतूपपत्ति), 374
- Restatement (पुनर्वचनम्), 70
- Result, fulfilment of, appearing immediately (मद्य कालान्तरफल-निष्पत्ति), 444
- Right cognition, means of (अभिधेयप्रयोजनम्), 3
- S**
- Siddhanta (सिद्धान्त), 86
- Savyabhichara (सन्वभिचार), 86
- Samanyatodrista (सामान्यतोदृष्ट), 25, 27
- Samanyachala (सामान्यच्छल), 97
- Scripture (शब्द), 184
- Scripture, medical (मन्त्रायुर्वेद-प्रामाण्यम्), 191
- Self contradiction (व्याहनत्वम्), 440
- Sense-organ (इन्द्रियार्थ), 17
- Sense organ, efficient and dull (इन्द्रियत्वविषयानिक्रमण), 478
- Sense perception (ग्रहणम्), 18
- Sense-organ, apprehension of (ऐन्द्रियकावम्), 202
- Sense-organ and its character (इन्द्रियभौतिकत्वम्), 291

- Sense-organ one or many (इन्द्रियनानात्वम्), 307
- Sense organ cutaneous (स्वगम्य-तिरेके), 310
- Sense organ, objects of, fivefold (इन्द्रियार्थपञ्चत्वम्), 314
- Sense-organs, objects of (इन्द्रियार्थाः),
- Similarity (साधर्म्यं), 104
- Sense organ as rudimentary substance (भूतगुणविशेषोपलब्धिः), 318
- Sense-perception untenable (प्रत्यक्षलक्षणानुपपत्तिः), 139
- Seshavai Inference (सोपवदनुमानम्), 25, 26
- Shifting the Probans (हितन्तरम्), 544
- Shifting the proposition (प्रति-शान्तरम्), 541
- Signification, absurd (असम्भूतार्थ-कल्पना), 99
- Similarity between things de-
nied and to be denied (प्रति-
पेक्षासिद्धिः),
- Soul (आत्मा), 32
- Soul, a variation (आत्मावस्था-
न्तरम्),
- Soul, distinct from Body (शरीर-
व्यतिरिक्तत्वमात्रं), 257
- Soul, different from mind
(आत्मनो मनोव्यतिक्रमः), 273
- Soul, distinct from sense organ
(इन्द्रियव्यतिरिक्तत्वमात्रं), 257
- Soul endowed with character of
cognition (आत्मन ज्ञानाभावात्), 376
- Soul, eternal (आत्मनिश्चयः), 276
- Soul, instrument of cognition
(ज्ञान साधनोपपत्तिः), 273
- Soul and substance unlike (इतरे-
तरद्रव्यगुणवैधर्म्यं), 330
- Soul, something eternal (सत्त्विक-
प्रदाहनिश्चयत्वम्), 260
- Sound (शब्दः), 39
- Sound, cessation of, non per-
ceptive (शब्दाभावानुपलब्धिः), 221
- Sound, audition of, eternal
(शब्दनिश्चयत्वमसंगः), 222
- Sound, destruction of non-valid
(शब्दसत्त्वानुपपत्तिः), 219
- Sound-existence, in space
(अन्तरालशब्दोपलब्धिः), 215
- Sound modification (शब्दपरि-
णामः), 224
- Sound, non apprehension of
(अनुपलब्ध्यावरणोपपत्तिः), 210
- Sound series (सन्तानानुमान-
विशेषः), 207
- Sound, subtraction of, entangli-
ble (अव्यक्तत्वम्), 223, 225
- Speech (वाक्), 41
- Subject, Enunciation of (अभि-
धेयप्रकरणं), 1
- Subjects (अभिधानं), 65
- Substance, diversity of (वर्ण-
विकारविकल्पः), 230
- Substance material (भूतानि), 38
- Sunyavada (शून्यवादः), 417
- Symbols restricted (लक्षणव्यव-
स्थानं), 434

T

- Tarka (cogitation) (तर्कः), 73
- Taste (रसः), 39

- Vascillation (प्रतिषेधानुपपत्तिः), 89, 518
 Vehicle (आश्रयः), 36
 View (तत्त्वः), 88
 Violating the proposition (प्रतिज्ञाहानिः), 541
 Viruddha (विरुद्धः), 86
 Visual (चक्षुः), 37
 Vitanda (वितण्डा), 85
 Void Theory (सर्वशून्यता), 435
- W**
- Water (आपः), 38
 Words (शब्दः), 16, 17, 29, 177, 241
 Word, the adristartha (अदृष्टार्थः), 30
 Word-colour (रूपः), 242
 Word-configuration of (व्यक्त्या-
 वृत्तिजातिसंनिधिः), 242
 Word-compounding (समासः), 242
 Word-contradiction (अपक्षयः), 242
 Word-Dristartha (दृष्टार्थः), 30
 Word, applied to past and
 future (अतीतानागतः), 418
 Word external, denied (वाह्यार्थ-
 भेगः), 486
 Words, enlargement of (शब्द-
 वृद्धिः), 242
 Words eternal and non-eternal
 (शब्दनित्यानित्यत्वं), 205
 Word giving (शब्दव्यागः), 242
 Word-grouping (शब्दसमूहः), 242
 Words, Non-eternality of (शब्द-
 नित्यता), 201
 Word-number (शब्दसंख्या), 242
 Word-possession (शब्दपरिग्रहः), 242
 Word-procreation (शब्दानुबन्धः), 242
 Word, result of chance (आक-
 स्मिकत्व), 424
 Words and their potencies
 (शब्दशक्तिः), 241
 Word, trustworthiness of
 (असिप्रामाण्यम्), 191
 Words universal (शब्दनित्यता), 242
 Words unrestricted (शब्दानव-
 स्थानता), 244
 Wrangling (वितण्डा), 4, 85

Vascillation (प्रतिषेधानुपपत्ति),	89, 518	Word external, denied (बाह्यार्थ- भंग)	486
Vehicle (आश्रय)	36	Words, enlargement of (शब्द- वृद्धि),	242
View (तत्त्व),	88	Words eternal and non eternal (शब्दनित्यनित्यत्व),	205
Violating the proposition (प्रतिज्ञाहानि),	541	Word giving (शब्दत्याग),	242
Viruddha (विरुद्ध),	86	Word grouping (शब्दसमूह),	242
Visual (दृश्य),	37	Words, Non eternality of (शब्द- नित्यता),	201
Vitanda (वितण्डा),	85	Word number (शब्दसंख्या),	242
Word Theory (सर्वशून्यता),	435	Word possession (शब्दपरिग्रह),	242
W		Word procreation (शब्दानुबन्ध),	242
Water (आप),	38	Word, result of chance (आक- स्मिकत्वं),	424
Words (शब्द),	16, 17, 29, 177, 241	Words and their potencies (शब्दशक्ति),	241
Word, the adristartha (अष्टार्थ),	30	Word trustworthiness of (आत्मप्रामाण्यम्),	191
Word colour (रूप),	242	Words universal (शब्दनित्यता),	242
Word configuration of (व्यक्ता कृतिनातिसंनिधि),	242	Words unrestricted (शब्दानव- स्थानता),	244
Word-compounding (समास),	242	Wrangling (वितण्डा),	4, 85
Word contradiction (अपचय),	242		
Word Dristartha (दृष्टार्थ),	30		
Word, applied to past and future (अतीतानागत),	418		